DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 046 HE 004 927

AUTHOR Jones, George W.
TITLE The Public University and Religious Practice: An Inquiry into University Provision for Campus Religious Life.
INSTITUTION Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 47306 (Free)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *College Environment; Essays; *Higher Education; Models; *Religion; *Religious Education; *Universities

ABSTRACT

This document presents an inquiry into university provision for campus religious life. Emphasis is placed on the question of custody; the basis litigation; support given; precedents for adjudication: what models of religious coordination are available; and who is responsible. Appendices include a statement regarding the relationships between the university and religious groups, a guide to religious counseling, and university religious affairs coordination models. A 51-item bibliography is included. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 086046

The Public University and Religious Practice: An Inquiry into University Provision for Campus Religious Life

George W. Jones
Director of Religious Programs and Related Activities
and Professor of Higher Education
Ball State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George W. Jones

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE004927

ED 086046

The Public University and Religious Practice: An Inquiry into University Provision for Campus Religious Life

George W. Jones
Director of Religious Programs and Related Activities
and Professor of Higher Education
Ball State University

Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306
1973

This publication is not for sale.

© George W. Jones 1973

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-620164

Contents

iv	Tables	
v	Foreword	
1	Chapter 1	A Question of Custody: Who Is Responsible?
6	Chapter 2	The Basis for Litigation: What Are the Rules?
13	Chapter 3	Establishing the Facts: What Support Is Given?
34	Chapter 4	Precedents for Adjudication: What Models of Religious Coordination Are Available?
44	Chapter 5	The Executors: Who Is Responsible?
54	Appendix A	A Statement Regarding the Relationships between _____ University and Religious Groups
56	Appendix B	A Guide to Religious Counseling at _____ University
58	Appendix C	University Religious Affairs Coordination Models
60	Bibliography	
63	Index	

Tables

4	TABLE	1	Institutions Responding by Accrediting Regions–1968
7	TABLE	2	Means of Relating Religious Life to Public Colleges and Universities–1968
9	TABLE	3	Means of Recognizing Ministers Assigned to Serve Public Colleges and Universities–1968
16	TABLE	4	University Provision for Religious Coordination
16	TABLE	5	Number of Student Religious Organizations per Campus–1968
17	TABLE	6	Requirements for Student Religious Organizations–1968
19	TABLE	7	Functions Fulfilled by Campus Religious Councils–1968
21	TABLE	8	Duties of Advisors to Religious Councils–1968
21	TABLE	9	Number of Ministers Employed by Religious Groups to Work at Public Colleges–1968
23	TABLE	10	University Staff Serving as Liaison with Campus Ministers–1968
27	TABLE	11	University Personnel with Religious Coordination Responsibilities–1968
45	TABLE	12	Percentage of Time Devoted to Responsibilities in Religious Coordination
46	TABLE	13	Personal Characteristics of Personnel Assigned to Religious Coordination
47	TABLE	14	Specialized Training in Religious Activities
48	TABLE	15	Religious Preference
50	TABLE	16	Time Spent in Religious Affairs Functions
50	TABLE	17	Roles or Patterns of Relating to Others
51	TABLE	18	Membership in Professional Associations

Foreword

In 1964 I was invited to Ball State University as the first full-time Director of Religious Programs. If my eleven years in campus ministry had taught me anything, it was that the attitude and policies of a university toward religious life on campus can either place severe limitations upon or greatly free a minister's work. Hence, the opportunity to effect university policy made the tendered position of coordinator of religious affairs most intriguing. I had heard of such positions during doctoral study in student personnel administration at Columbia University but had learned little about them. A vice president at Ball State stated the challenge succinctly, "I believe we have here an opportunity to develop a middle way between an unconstitutional establishment of religion and an indifference to religion which amounts on many campuses to an establishment of irreligion or secularism." Once on the job, I saw that university policies regarding religious life also have a great deal to to with the quality of education available to students.

In the work I received much interest and emotional support from the staff of Ball State, but little counsel about what it was I should be doing or how I should be going about it. At that critical point, I discovered a small cadre of similar officers linked professionally in the Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs (ACURA). To these peers I acknowledge my indebtedness for helping me to develop a philosophy of university-church relationships and to express it in policies guiding my work. When ACURA in 1968 saw the need for a national survey of religious coordination at public colleges and again in 1972 asked for a follow-up study, I agreed gladly to conduct the studies.

To the officers of ACURA, particularly Charles Minneman of Eastern Michigan University, the 1967-68 president, I am especially indebted for advice in developing and testing the survey instrument. Richard W. Burkhardt, Vice President for Instructional Affairs at Ball State University, demonstrated his support of the study by granting me the 1968 McClintock Award for faculty research. Graduate assistants Linda Pegram, Joseph Fritzsche, and Richard Olson aided in the analysis of data. I also wish to express appreciation to the Ball State Faculty Publications Committee, Dr. Casey Tucker, chairman and Dr. Daryl Adrian, past chairman, for approving this report for publication and to the Office of University Publications for assistance in the final preparation of copy for publication. Most of all, I am indebted to my wife, Garnell, for helping with typing and for providing encouragement to finish the task.

Chapter 1

A Question of Custody: Who Is Responsible?

Alexander Miller, the late professor of religious studies at Stanford University, observed:

> Once the church and the university were wed. Then they found they couldn't live together, so they got divorced, with the university charging mental cruelty. But they also found they couldn't live apart, and now they are trying to figure out how to reconstitute the relationship.[1]

Responsibility for the study and the practice of religion was the common property over which this litigation was waged. Miller saw the ministers, rabbis, and priests assigned by religious bodies to college posts to be the chief "brokers" working at the process of reconciliation.

Both private and public institutions became involved, as it were, in these proceedings of divorce. Some 600 private and church-related institutions employ official chaplains who conduct worship services, offer pastoral care, and teach courses in religion, in addition to functioning as intermediaries with off-campus religious groups and agencies.

State colleges and universities, too, employ specialized personnel to negotiate their relationships with religious groups. John Eddy, in his 1967 doctoral study, found approximately sixty persons working at least one-fourth time as coordinators of religious activities or directors of religious affairs at state institutions.[2] The coordinator, the favored, shortened form of the title, "is not usually a chaplain, in the sense [that] he is willing to be identified in the university as one who preaches or confesses a particular faith."[3] Rather, he is clearly the university's man—a layman, an educator.

Charles Minneman, Director of the Office of Religious Affairs at Eastern Michigan University since 1959 and a past president of the Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs, the professional organization of these university officers, identified his three major tasks as coordination, cocurricular programming, and counseling. Each of these tasks he described in more detail as follows:

> *Coordination*[4] involves the ordering of inter-relationships obtaining between church/synagogue and university qua institutions along with their various sub-

[1] As quoted by William Hamilton Jones, "The Minister on Campus," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, IV (December 15, 1969), 6.

[2] John Paul Eddy. "Comparison of the Characteristics and Activities of Religious Personnel Employed in Selected Four-Year State Colleges and Universities in the United States," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1968.

[3] Kenneth Underwood, *The Church, The University, and Social Policy*, I (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969), 72.

[4] In the present report liaison will be used to denote the activities which Minneman referred to as coordination. Less confusion results when coordination is used to encompass all three of the basic functions of a university religious affairs officer.

agencies. On the church side of this equation, coordination will involve college and university work denominational agencies, ecumenical ministries, staff clergy associations, local congregations, councils of churches, and denominational student religious organizations. On the university side . . . some of the administrative offices [are president, academic affairs, student affairs, public affairs]; also involved, in many instances, will be a presidentially-appointed faculty advisory committee, a student religious affairs council, and/or combination "task force" units. . . .

Counseling is a second functional area in university religious affairs. The religious counsel provided by denominational chaplains and staff members in an office of religious affairs helps assure a full complement of university counseling services. Likewise, the counseling services of the religious agencies is assisted through referral to, consultation with, and training under counseling professionals in the university. A workable inter-agency communications pattern in counseling is enabled by the religion-university coordinative efforts of an office of religious affairs.

Co-curricular programming by an office of religious affairs involves task force efforts in various study-and-work areas. Typical study-and-work areas with examples of programs in each are (1) *Studies in Religion*—systematic study of the facts about religion and the issues with which religions deal coupled with the advancement of scholarship in the field of religion: Seminars in Religion, Summer European Theological Study Tours, Inter-Faith Dialogues; (2) *Religion and Culture*—exploration and articulation of the relationships obtaining between religion and human activity generally with all its cultural artifacts: Concert-Lecture Series, Faculty Firesides, Arts Festivals, New York Seminar on Drama, Coffee Houses, Film Productions; (3) *Ceremonies*—structuring and resourcing ceremonial frameworks which permit the university to celebrate the excellencies shaped in its midst: Honors Convocations, Awards Banquets, Commencement, University Chapel Series; (4) *Social Action*—research education and resource action addressed to current issues, concerns, and needs both on-campus and in the larger society: Campus Service Corps, Peace Corps Liaison, Skills Tutorials, Radical Student Movement Liaison; (5) *Communications*—communication with the various publics related to and/or served by the university and its related religious agencies: Publications, Information Services, Student Government Representation, "Chapter 1" Freshman Camps, Residence Hall Programs.[5]

Several studies indicate that nearly all state colleges and universities generally accept some responsibility for one or more of these religious affairs functions. Balcer, Harris, and Holmgren in 1959 found on the basis of returns from 148 state colleges (58 percent of the total with enrollments under 5,000 in 44 states) that cocurricular religious programming was reported at 86 percent of the colleges.[6] H. D. Peterson in a 1964 survey of the 200 largest state universities (91 percent return) reported that a sizeable majority officially sponsored certain types of religious activities, such as religious emphasis weeks.[7] Charles Crouch concluded on the basis of data from a 1962 survey (88 percent return) of the four-year state colleges and universities that three out of five institutions had coordinating councils which supervised cocurricular religious activities.[8] In each study over 90 percent of the colleges reported

[5] Charles Minneman, "Religion as a University Affair," *Michigan College Personnel Association Journal*, V (Spring, 1968) 21-24.
[6] Charles Balcer, James Harris, and Marvin Holmgren; "Religious Activities in Public Colleges," *St. Cloud State College Bulletin*, XIV (May, 1959).
[7] H. D. Peterson, "The Role of Religion at Selected State Colleges and Universities in the United States," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1965.
[8] Charles Crouch, "Religious Activities in the Tax-Supported Colleges and Universities," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1962.

student religious organizations, making these the most universal expression of religious practice on American college campuses.[9] These studies also indicated differences in the effect of founding date, regional location, and enrollment on the ways colleges relate to religious forces serving the campuses.

The Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs (ACURA), organized in 1959 by student affairs staff people with primary responsibilities for religious affairs, endorsed in 1966 a research proposal by John Eddy to determine the functions and characteristics of full-time religious coordinators. In 1967 George Jones, then vice president of ACURA, suggested that a study be made of religious coordination at the four-year public colleges and universities, especially those without staff devoting a major portion of their time to coordination. Because an American College Personnel Association (ACPA) survey in 1967 had found that supervision of student organizations, presumably including religious organizations, was a function of the majority of student activity directors at both public and private colleges and universities,[10] endorsement by the ACPA Commission IV, Students, Their Activities, and Their Community, was secured. A research grant was awarded George Jones by Ball State University to assist with this project. In 1972, due to a delay in publication of the results of the 1968 study, the ACURA Executive Committee asked Jones to conduct a follow-up survey to ascertain to what degree the 1968 data was still valid.

Methodology

The 1968 study was designed to determine to what extent the public colleges and universities accept responsibility for functions defined as coordination (cocurricular programming, counseling, and liaison with religious groups) of religious affairs. More specifically, answers were sought through the survey to the following questions:

(1) What policies guide public colleges and universities in carrying out responsibilities in coordination of religious affairs?
(2) Which religious coordination functions are assumed by the public colleges and universities?
(3) Who are the staff people to whom religious coordination functions are assigned?
(4) What patterns of organization are utilized in religious coordination?
(5) What trends were reported in coordination of religious affairs?
(6) What needs of personnel assigned to religious coordination could be met by professional organizations?

The 1972 follow-up also requested information on functions performed, administrative title, and professional affiliation of the person on the college or university staff with major responsibility for religious coordination.

[9] For a history of the early development of campus ministries, see Clarence Shedd, *The Church Follows Its Students* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938).
[10] James Marine, "Student Activities Staff Functions: Sum and Substance," unpublished report prepared for American College Personnel Association, Commission IV, April, 1968.

Responses to the Study

Of the 418 colleges and universities included in the final population for the 1968 study, 273, or 65 percent, returned useable questionnaires. Since not all questions were answered on every questionnaire, the total number of responses for specific questions in many cases was less than 273. In the 1972 study, 321, or 64 percent, of the 505 institutions included in that survey returned the postcard questionnaire.

Analysis of the data was aided by computer. Answers were coded and recorded on scanning sheets. The computer program requested data in the form of totals and percentages by categories and analysis according to certain factors found critical in previous studies.

At least one institution in every state, Guam, and the District of Columbia responded. The fraction of questionnaires returned in the 1968 study varied, however, from as low as one-third in the case of the District of Columbia to all from nine states, generally Western states with a small number of institutions. The variation was not as great when the totals were compared by accrediting regions. However, again the schools in the three most westerly regions returned the highest percentages.

TABLE 1
Institutions Responding by Accrediting Regions
1968

	Total No. Mailed	Received	No. Not Returned	% of Return
Middle States	59	32	25	58
New England	38	24	14	65
North Central	151	101	50	67
Northwest	25	19	6	76
Southern	117	74	43	63
Western	28	21	7	75
	418	273	145	65

Of the 32 state colleges that were founded primarily to serve Negroes, a completed questionnaire in 1968 was received from 12 schools, 37 percent of the total. This percentage is significantly less than for the total population, hence any projections of results for all Negro colleges would be misleading. The Eddy study in 1966, which did obtain more complete data from Negro colleges, revealed considerable differences between the predominantly Negro and white colleges in terms of budget provided for religious affairs (lower), salaries offered directors (lower), and the number of schools employing full-time personnel in religious affairs (higher).[11]

As will be noted throughout this report, regional differences exist in both the kind and amount of provision made for religious coordination. These

[11] John Paul Eddy, *op. cit.*, 108-112.

differences cannot be eliminated as a factor influencing return of the questionnaires. If the person receiving the questionnaire did not perceive anyone on his staff as having "major responsibility for liaison with student religious organizations and/or campus ministers or for advising college sponsored programs of a religious nature," as the instructions read, the likelihood that he would return a questionnaire might have been less. This cannot be assumed to be true in all cases, however, since 16, or 29 percent, of the colleges with full-time coordinators in 1966 did not respond to the 1968 questionnaire. This is a higher percentage of nonrespondents than in either the Northwest or Western regions in the 1968 study. Caution then must be exercised in making inferences from these studies of 1968 and 1972 to the total population of state colleges and universities.

Chapter 2

The Basis for Litigation: What Are the Rules?

Unlike divorce proceedings, in which legal process is well established, universities and churches have not had a body of law or precedence to guide them in determining the responsibility for religious life on campus. Therefore, each state college and university has approached its relationships to religious activities and personnel in differing ways. Policy statements are at least an indication of an institution's intentions. This chapter presents data regarding the nature and content of state universities' policies governing religious practice on the campus.

Other studies indicate that state colleges most frequently in the past have utilized the technique of recognition of student religious organizations as their chief means of relating religion to the campus program.[1] The policies behind these practices were found by Crouch generally to be unwritten (80 percent) and to have been made at the administrative level (two-thirds) rather than the governing board level. Larger schools were more likely to have written policies. Schools in the South, on the other hand, were least likely to have committed their policies to writing.

In the 1968 study, questions were asked regarding policies relating to recognition of student religious groups and of ministers assigned to the campus. Furthermore, information was sought regarding the level at which these policies had been set and whether they were written or unwritten. The 1972 questionnaire, being limited to a postcard, did not include requests for information on policies relating to religious practices.

Recognition of Religious Organizations

Recognition of student organizations is the way state colleges and universities most frequently choose to approach relating religious practice to the life of the campus. Fifty-two percent of the colleges and universities responding indicated that their policy was to recognize student religious organizations and to name a staff member to work with them. Some variations from the national average were reported regionally. Two-thirds of the colleges and universities in the Western (California) and New England regions reported that this was their policy; whereas the Middle States and Southern regions had the lowest percentage (47 percent) admitting this policy (See Table 2).

In addition to recognition of student religious organizations, 35 percent of the colleges and universities reported that it is their policy to work with

[1] Charles Crouch, *op. cit.*

TABLE 2

MEANS OF RELATING RELIGIOUS LIFE TO PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1968

	Middle States		New England		North Central		Northwest		Southern		Western		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Religious groups contact whatever office seems appropriate	8	24	6	25	31	32	9	39	9	12	10	48	73	27
Student religious organizations recognized	16	47	16	67	48	50	12	52	35	47	14	67	141	52
Administrative officer designated to work with religious organizations	10	29	6	25	43	44	7	30	43	58	5	24	114	42
Religious groups work through an interfaith council	12	35	6	25	36	37	4	17	31	42	6	29	95	35
Minister employed to conduct services and programs	3	9	0	0	2	2	0	0	5	7	0	0	10	4
Total	34		24		97		23		74		21		273	

Some colleges utilize more than one means of relating to religious life; hence, several columns add up to more than the N or 100 percent.

religious groups as they are represented on an interfaith council which functions on their campus. This practice is most common in schools in Southern (43 percent) and North Central (37 percent) regions and least common in New England (22 percent). Again, Southern and North Central institutions are most likely to designate a definite administrative officer to handle their relationships with religious organizations (58 and 44 percent respectively, compared with a national average of 42 percent). Western and New England schools, on the other hand, are least likely to utilize this arrangement.

Recognition of Campus Ministers

With the appearance on college campuses of large numbers of full-time campus ministers, dissatisfaction with the approach of only granting recognition to student religious organizations has been reported.[2] A definite status of their own has been suggested as an answer to the low morale of campus ministers.[3] In response to this need, at least one vice president of student affairs recognizes the ministers assigned to his campus as an official division of his student affairs staff.[4]

The status of clergy and other workers named by local and national religious groups to serve on state college and university campuses was found in this study to be considerably more ambiguous than the status of student religious organizations. One-third of the colleges stated that their policy is to grant no recognition. Those which do most frequently grant this to ministers as sponsors of student religious organizations (29 percent), evidence again that state colleges and universities prefer the student organization route of providing for religious affairs. One-fourth of the institutions reported recognition of ministers who belong to a campus ministerial association. A few recognize ministers directly as chaplains (15 percent), as counselors (8 percent), or, in the case of some Southwestern institutions, as "Bible Chair" faculty who teach credit courses in religion. The residence hall program provides the basis for recognition on one campus (See Table 3).

A problem evidently exists for universities wishing to grant an official status to campus ministers. No generally acceptable criteria are available to use in determining which ministers should be recognized or what their status in the university should be. The 1972 study, although not surveying policy questions directly, revealed that the dilemma of recognition of campus ministers has intensified. The percentage of institutions reporting a practice of liaison with campus ministers has increased from 46 to 69 percent during the four-year period.

Predominately Negro colleges in the South and the federal service academies are the only institutions which directly employ ministers as chaplains to conduct worship services and perform other functions of the clergy. In fact,

[2] Parker Rossman, "The Morale of the Campus Minister," *Religious Education*, LVII (March, 1963), 110-113, 159-160.
[3] Parker Rossman, "The Denominational Chaplain in the State University," *Religious Education*, LV (May, 1960), 174-181.
[4] Ronald E. Barnes, "Where the Action Is," *N.A.S.P.A. Journal*, IV (April, 1967), 183-185.

TABLE 3

MEANS OF RECOGNIZING MINISTERS ASSIGNED TO SERVE PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1968

	Middle States			New England			North Central			Northwest			Southern			Western			Total
	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ministers are designated as university chaplain staff	26.5	70.6	2.9	37.5	62.5	–	10.3	89.7	–	4.3	95.7	–	14.9	85.1	–	4.8	95.2	–	15.0
Ministers are accredited as counselors	8.8	88.2	2.9	16.7	83.3	–	5.2	94.8	–	–	100.0	–	12.2	87.8	–	9.5	90.5	–	8.4
Ministers recognized as organization sponsors	26.5	70.6	2.9	12.5	87.5	–	32.0	68.0	–	47.8	52.2	–	29.7	70.3	–	14.3	85.7	–	28.9
Ministers relate through ministerial association	14.7	82.4	2.9	4.2	95.8	–	34.0	66.0	–	21.7	78.3	–	23.0	77.0	–	33.3	66.7	–	24.9
No recognition granted. Ministers contact university as needed	23.5	73.5	2.9	25.0	75.0	–	30.9	69.1	–	30.4	69.6	–	37.8	62.2	–	57.1	42.9	–	33.3
Other	11.8	85.3	2.9	4.2	95.8	–	2.1	97.9	–	21.7	78.3	–	9.5	90.5	–	–	100.0	–	7.0

NA = No Answer

of the ten Black colleges and universities which responded to the 1968 survey, five reported a college-employed chaplain. One indicated that it was served by a volunteer chaplain, and two others reported a dean or director of chapel. Only two indicated that they do not have an official college chaplain or director of the chapel. The provision of chaplains at the federal service academies is evidently a carry over from military practice. Indeed, one academy stated that its chaplain is provided by the armed service for which it trains leadership.

Difficulty in recognizing ministers directly seems to be related to fears of legal entanglements and/or mistrust of the ministers, according to comments written in the margins of the 1968 questionnaires. Too much recognition of ministers, in fact, might be considered to be an establishment of religion. Recognition of some and not of others also could lead to accusations of favoritism. "In our state, . . . there is some fear of state approval or involvement in religious activities on a state campus," noted one dean of students. Legal reasons for this fear were stated by some. However, others expressed distrust of campus ministers and their activities particularly those in relation to change-oriented or politically radical student groups. The preference, therefore, seems to be for recognition of campus ministers to be unofficial and for communication to be informal.

Nature of Policy Statements

In most cases, the policy statements regarding religious practice in state colleges and universities are unwritten but are generally believed to be understood. When a policy is unwritten, its authority is seen most likely to derive from the chief student personnel officer of the particular institution. On the other hand, written policies regarding recognition of religious organizations and campus ministers (28 percent of those responding so indicated) were most likely to have been written by the governing board of the college. Less frequently the president of the college or university was reported to have written the policy. The chief student personnel officer only rarely is credited with being the authority for an official written policy.

On the basis of findings of the 1968 study, the conclusion of Rossman still seems valid:

> It would appear that in a number of cases there is a "policy to have no policy." . . . One university administrator perhaps summed up the situation for many when he said: "We do not need a policy statement as long as things go well, and we are not in a proper frame of mind to negotiate policy when things are not going well."[5]

Regional Differences

Clearly regional differences exist in policies in relating religion to the rest of campus life. New England respondents, for example, reported the highest

[5] Parker Rossman, "The Denominational Chaplain", p. 180.

proportion of schools granting direct recognition to student religious organizations (two-thirds) and the highest percentage granting clergy status as chaplains (three-eighths) but the lowest percentage of interfaith councils. The Western region, although reporting recognition of student religious organizations just as frequently as New England colleges, had the most consistent policy toward ministers—no recognition (57 percent). Religion at schools in these regions is evidently not considered to be a university concern but rather a matter to be left to religious bodies. They differ only in the official recognition they are willing to accord religious functionaries. New England colleges, moreover, seem more likely to make some provision, as will be seen later, for assisting officially designated representatives of religious bodies in doing their work.

On the other hand, Southern colleges, closely followed by those in the North Central area, are most likely to have an official policy which recognizes religion to be a part of the educational program. Schools in these regions most frequently name an administrative officer to work with and give direct support to student religious organizations. The data indicate that this is done frequently by means of an interfaith council which often is an official part of the student government of the institution.

Middle States and Northwest regions represented a position intermediate to the above patterns. Schools in these regions were closer to national averages in the number which granted official recognition to student religious organizations. Middle States institutions follow the lead of their New England neighbors, ranking second in the tendency to give official chaplain status to campus ministers, whereas this policy in the Northwest is practically nonexistent as it is in neighboring California. Schools in the Northwest presented the most consistent pattern of any region. The policy most prevalent there is to recognize campus ministers as student organization sponsors. About one-third of the colleges in the Northwest and Middle States areas report naming an administrator as the liaison officer with religious groups and ministers.

Trends in Official Policy

Trends are difficult to establish due to lack of comparable studies in the past and the fact that the 1972 postcard survey did not ask questions regarding policies. No studies were found which reported national statistics on recognition of ministers by state colleges. Apparently, the percentage of colleges and universities granting recognition to student religious organizations may be declining even though the number reporting religious organizations is greater. Balcer, Harris, and Holmgren, in their 1958 study of smaller state colleges, reported that all but seven percent granted official recognition.[6] Their return included 148 colleges with enrollments under 5,000. To the extent that the present study is comparable to that study, more state colleges and universities

[6] Charles Balcer, James Harris, and Marvin Holmgren, *op. cit.*

today report the existence of student religious organizations but a smaller percentage grant official recognition. This practice may be a reflection of the tendency on the part of some institutions to discontinue official recognition of student organizations as a part of dropping the role of standing *in loco parentis* to students.

Although the percentage of schools reporting written policies in this study is approximately the same as in the Crouch study, apparently some changes have occurred during the decade. Whereas Crouch found Southern colleges were least likely to have written policies, at the end of the decade these schools were second only to New England institutions in this regard. Written policies were reported in 1968 by only about 50 percent of the North Central schools which had reported them in 1960.

That confusion exists today in determining the policies needed for relating to religion is evident from the diversity of policies within even a single state. Tensions reported in the written comments confirm this conclusion. Several respondents cited major problems to be lack of coordination and the fact that religious groups were becoming more independent.

Conclusions

Policies establish the parameters within which relationships are possible. Too narrow parameters restrict unnecessarily the possibilities for cooperative projects which might enrich available educational offerings. On the other hand, too broad or nonexistent policies may result in insufficient structure for adequate communication and programming. A policy statement which has served one institution some nine years as a basis for cooperation between itself and the religious forces serving the campus is included in Appendix A of this study.

Chapter 3

Establishing the Facts: What Support Is Given?

Rumors regarding the cruel and inhuman treatment of religion on America's public college campuses have been rampant. University policy statements may indicate good intentions, but the actual provision of supporting programs and personnel is more apt to reveal the facts of the case. The chief purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which public four-year colleges and universities do in fact provide for the cocurricular religious functions of liaison with religious groups and personnel, religious programming and counseling.

Charles Crouch in 1962 found that 96 percent of the institutions reported some kind of on-campus religious activity and that 60 percent reported coordinating councils with programming functions. Two-thirds of these councils were reported to have had paid directors at least on a part-time basis. Crouch did not distinguish between those paid directly by the state institution and those paid by religious groups. Apparently several received funds from both sources. The activities sponsored, in order of frequency, were (1) religious emphasis week, (2) religious discussion groups, (3) religion courses, (4) lecture series, (5) community service projects, and (6) charity drives. He reported this pattern to be strongest in the Southern and North Central regions and lowest in the Northeast.[1]

The St. Cloud State College study in 1958 of smaller public colleges generally sought the same information as did Crouch. Of those reporting, 14 percent indicated that they did not have religious organizations on campus either because they did not exist or because of a policy not to grant official recognition. No direct reference was made to a coordinating council of the type described by Crouch; however, 72 percent of the colleges reported a religious emphasis week with a "student-faculty planning committee" being utilized "by virtually all of the colleges holding religious emphasis week."[2] Could Crouch's coordinating councils have been an elaboration of the student-faculty planning committees for religious emphasis weeks reported by the St. Cloud researchers? The fact that a religious emphasis week was the most frequent activity of the coordinating councils reported by Crouch leads one to suspect strongly that on many campuses religious emphasis week planning committees were identified by Crouch as religious coordinating councils. E. Donl Peterson, too, in his 1964 survey of the 200 largest state universities, found a close correlation between those reporting religious emphasis weeks and those reporting councils.[3]

---

[1] Charles Crouch, *op. cit.*
[2] Charles Balcer, James Harris, and Marvin Holmgren, *op. cit.*
[3] H. D. Peterson, *op. cit.*

Religious emphasis weeks greatly declined during the sixties. A follow-up survey of the Peterson study by the present author revealed that by the time Peterson published his data (1966) nearly one-third of the colleges which he had reported to have had religious emphasis weeks had stopped the practice. A hypothesis in this regard in that the decline in religious emphasis weeks was accompanied by a decline in religious coordinating councils and in paid staff advisors.

The fact that Crouch found that faculty or administrative representatives were present on 97 percent of these committees could be the basis for his conclusion that the majority of these councils had paid coordinators or advisors. Eddy found in his 1967 study that approximately 80 percent of his "full-time" religious affairs personnel reported working with a campus religious council.[4] Apparently the need on many campuses for an administrator to oversee the work of the student-faculty committees in executing a full-orbed religious emphasis week provided the necessary justification for a religious coordinator.

The means by which colleges recognized student religious organizations was ascertained only by the St. Cloud study. Student religious organizations were required to submit an application (75 percent of the campuses), file a copy of their constitution (67 percent), and secure a faculty advisor (73 percent). In return, student religious organizations could obtain meeting space on campus (73 percent), utilize campus publicity media (69 percent), use college office equipment and supplies (52 percent), receive help with financial records (31 percent), and make purchases through the college (21 percent).

Public colleges and universities according to these previous studies have provided for cocurricular programs on religion, in some cases directly through assignment of a staff person with program responsibility and indirectly in more cases by permitting, and in some cases advising, student religious organizations and coordinating councils. Liaison with campus ministers and their programs was a third means of providing a religious cocurriculum.

Questions were asked of chief student personnel officers in the 1968 study regarding the number of student religious organizations on campus, requirements for recognition and the nature of privileges granted. Information on the existence of and function of religious coordinating councils or boards and the role of advisory personnel provided by the university was also sought. Data regarding the number of ministers serving the campus and the nature of the college's liaison with these persons employed by religious agencies were also collected. In addition, questions were asked about provision of facilities and programs directly by the institution. The 1972 survey gave the chief student personnel officer an opportunity to indicate which, if any, religious coordination functions were assigned to a paid university staff person.

Findings

Nearly two-thirds of America's public colleges designate a staff person as primary liaison with the religious forces serving their campuses. Apparently

[4] John Paul Eddy, *op. cit.*

the nature of these forces has been shifting. In 1968 the chief contact was with student religious organizations; whereas, in 1972 it was with clergy assigned to the campus. Between one-half and one-fourth of the institutions in responding to both studies also reported assuming responsibility for distribution of religious preference data, religious counseling, and cocurricular religious programming. Only a small minority of public colleges provide on-campus religious services or facilities (See Table 4). Each of these items were examined in more detail in 1968 than in the 1972 study.

The data of the 1968 study clearly indicate that student religious organizations are ubiquitous in American public four-year colleges. The median state college reported from five to nine student religious organizations (See Table 5), and only three institutions (one percent) reported no student religious organizations. Two of these were newly-organized colleges in which student life generally was unorganized. The third stated that it had had such an organization but that it no longer existed. The number of colleges without student religious groups is significantly lower than that reported in any of the previous studies cited. New England colleges on the average reported the fewest religious organizations on a particular campus. Colleges in the North Central, Southern, and Northwest regions reported the largest number.

The methods for recognition of student religious organizations are fairly consistent throughout the country (See Table 6). Specifically, student religious organizations in order to be recognized, at approximately 70 percent of the colleges, are expected to file an application, secure approval of a constitution, and arrange for a faculty sponsor or advisor. Approximately 50 percent of the institutions in addition require religious organizations to clear on-campus speakers ahead of time and to register their activities on the student activities calendar. Approximately six percent of colleges and universities from all sections exempt student religious organizations from requirements applying to student organizations in general.

In return, the privileges granted by colleges to religious groups reported in order of frequency are (1) publicity in campus media (91 percent), (2) meeting space in college buildings (89 percent), (3) use of a campus organization mailbox (67 percent), and (4) office space (10 percent). Apparently many colleges which do not require religious organizations to be registered or recognized still permit them to hold meetings and to publicize their meetings on campus. Some tendency also exists to deny certain privileges to religious organizations extended to other organizations.

The region with the most consistent practices from campus to campus appears to be the Western region (California). This is also the region reporting the highest degree of administrative control of student religious organizations.

Public colleges, with a high degree of consistency across the country, assume some responsibility for relationships with student groups organized for religious purposes by assigning this responsibility to a definite officer. Of the

TABLE 4
UNIVERSITY PROVISION FOR RELIGIOUS COORDINATION

Religious Coordination Functions	1968 Survey 273 Institutions Reporting		1972 Survey 263 Institutions Reporting		"New" 1972 58 Institutions Reporting	
	N	% of those responding	N	% of those responding	N	% of those responding
Liaison with student religious organizations	232	85	171	64	31	55
Liaison with religious leaders serving campus	119	46	181	69	31	55
Distribution of religious preference information	96	35	117	44	10	18
Counseling students regarding religious matters	97	36	77	30	12	21
Cocurricular programming (lectures, seminars, service-projects)	131	48	72	27	8	14
Advising an interfaith council	84	31	46	18	7	13
Administration of a building for religious purposes	44	16	35	14	4	5
Conducting worship and other on-campus religious services	41	15	27	11	1	1
Other functions	—	—	20	8	1	1

TABLE 5
NUMBER OF STUDENT RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS PER CAMPUS
1968

	None	1-4	5-9	10-14	15 or More	Not Indicated
Number	3	59	92	47	31	37
%	1.1	21.6	33.7	17.2	11.4	13.6

TABLE 6
REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDENT RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS*
1968

	Middle States			New England			North Central			Northwest			Southern			Western		
	Req.	Not Req.	Exempted	Req.	Not Req.	Exempted	Req.	Not Req.	Exempted	Req.	Not Req.	Exempted	Req.	Not Req.	Exempted	Req.	Not Req.	Exempted
File application	61.8	–	5.9	54.2	16.7	4.2	70.1	8.2	4.1	73.9	8.7	–	78.4	5.4	9.5	100.0	–	–
Secure approval of their constitution	58.8	8.8	5.9	62.5	16.7	4.2	71.1	8.2	6.2	87.0	4.3	–	62.2	10.8	12.2	95.2	4.8	–
Arrange for faculty sponsor or advisor	61.8	2.9	5.9	75.0	4.2	4.2	70.0	6.2	5.2	78.3	4.3	–	67.6	6.8	13.5	81.0	19.0	–
Submit financial records for audit	11.8	23.5	17.6	37.5	20.8	8.8	24.7	34.0	7.2	8.7	47.8	8.7	17.6	40.5	12.2	28.6	52.4	–
Clear on-campus speakers ahead of time	14.7	32.4	2.9	29.2	37.5	8.3	42.3	27.8	3.1	43.5	26.1	4.3	47.3	27.0	5.4	9.5	81.0	–
Register activities with student activities calendar	44.1	23.5	2.9	62.5	20.8	4.2	55.7	23.7	5.2	60.9	8.7	4.3	56.8	14.9	10.8	71.4	28.6	–
Other	2.9	–	–	4.2	4.2	–	7.2	1.0	–	8.7	–	–	8.1	1.4	–	19.0	–	–

* These figures are in percentages based on the total number responding to the survey. In most cases the numbers do not total 100 percent because of a number not answering the particular question.

personnel responding in 1968, 232, or 83 percent, indicated that a definite officer on their campus had responsibility for this relationship. The variation ranged from 81 percent in the North Central region to 89 percent in the Southern area. This person was reported to be a member of the student affairs staff by more than 80 percent of the colleges answering this question. Most regions are fairly consistent in that at the largest number of schools the chief student personnel officer retains this function. Only in Western schools do a higher percentage delegate this to an assistant dean. Student activity directors who perform this function were found most frequently at North Central, Middle States, and Western colleges. The only areas reporting significant numbers of directors of religious activities performing this function were the North Central and Southern regions. Fewer than one percent reported that a member of the instructional staff performs this function.

The 1972 survey indicates that the practice of assigning a college staff person to the task of liaison with religious organizations is declining. Of the institutions responding to both surveys, those reporting a religion liaison officer declined from 84 percent in 1968 to 55 percent in 1972.

Coordinating Councils

Officially sponsored religious coordinating councils were found at approximately one-third of the public colleges in 1968. The percentage had declined to 18 percent in 1972. The number of colleges reporting the existence of a religious council or board on which student religious organizations are represented and which has responsibility for campus-wide religious programming was consistent with data obtained from the question regarding general policies. Some 43 percent, or 117, reported some kind of a council, although seven percent indicated that not all religious groups on the campus were represented. This percentage is considerably less than that reported in comparable studies in 1958 and 1962. Only the North Central and Southern regions had more colleges reporting religious councils than those which did not. In addition, only these regions had 10 or more colleges reporting such councils.

The activities which were reported by more than 50 percent of these councils in 1968 were (1) communications among religious groups, (2) on-campus programs of an educational nature about religion, (3) distribution of religious preference information, and (4) the religious phases of new student orientation. Other functions reported by some of those councils were arranging for joint activities of member groups, conducting interfaith retreats, sponsoring worship services, executing service projects, providing liaison between religious groups and other campus organizations, and conducting a campus charity drive (See Table 7).

Advisors to Student Religious Councils

The percentage of universities designating an officer to work with religious councils is considerably smaller than the number identifying one to be

TABLE 7

FUNCTIONS FULFILLED BY CAMPUS RELIGIOUS COUNCILS

1968

(Total = 117)	Number	Percent
Communication among religious groups	111	95
On-campus programs of educational nature	91	78
Religious preference information distribution	70	60
Religious phase of new student orientation	61	52
Arrangements for activities planned by member groups	57	49
Interfaith retreats and conferences	54	46
Campus worship services	53	45
Relationships with other student organizations	49	42
Community service projects	49	42
Campus charity fund drives	40	34
Duplicating and other services for members	16	14

responsible for relations with student religious organizations. Of the 117 campuses reporting some kind of religious coordinating council in 1968, 68 percent, or 79, reported a specific university officer working with it. This number had dropped to 53 in 1972. Only 29 percent of the total number of schools responding to the 1968 survey reported an officer working with a religious council as compared with 43 percent of the schools which reported a council. Frequently this officer was a director of religious affairs, a chaplain, or a campus minister. Only in about 60 percent of the cases did his title indicate that he is a member of the student affairs staff.

These data suggest than on many campuses religious councils are considered to be more an expression of the religious agencies than an integral part of the cocurriculum for which the university is responsible. Consequently on these campuses it would only be right that these councils be advised primarily, if they are advised at all, by the representatives of the religious agencies rather than by an official of the college.

Regional differences were marked. Schools in the North Central and Southern regions were most likely to designate a staff person to work with the campus religious council. When these percentages are compared, however, with those of campuses reporting religious councils, it appears that schools in these two regions, although reporting a higher percentage of councils than other regions, do not supply as high a percentage of these councils with advisors. The total, however, is comparable to the number in those regions which reported councils on which *all* groups are represented. Apparently in these two regions some tendency exists to give some official recognition to coalitions which include some but not all of the religious groups. However, this special treatment for united groups seems to stop short of provision of a staff advisor.

Data were also sought in 1968 on the functions of the university-appointed advisors to religious councils. Program advising was the only universally

reported function of these officers. Approximately two-thirds also have some responsibility for advising their council regarding finances. Nearly half of the officers are directly responsible for program planning and in some cases research on and evaluation of the programs of the campus religious groups. Again, a university officer with strong programming and directing functions is most prevalent in Southern and North Central regions. Such officers are practically nonexistent at colleges in the Northeast or on the Pacific Coast (See Table 8).

Liaison with Campus Ministers

Religious personnel assigned by churches and synagogues to serve the public colleges and universities represent a major commitment by religious agencies to the higher education enterprise in the United States. The 184 colleges and universities which responded in 1968 to the question on the number of ministers, rabbis, priests, and nuns serving their campuses reported more than 1,000 such persons assigned to their campuses on a full-time basis. A lesser number of institutions in addition reported nearly 900 others serving on a part-time basis. A projection of these numbers to the total number of 418 public colleges and universities in 1968 indicates that American four-year public colleges and universities are served by approximately 5,000 ministers about half of whom are assigned at least two-thirds of their time to a ministry on the college campus. An average campus would then be served by approximately twelve religious workers, five of whom devote most of their time to a ministry on campus. The remaining seven typically would be ministers, priests, rabbis, or lay leaders who have major responsibility with a town congregation but devote some time specifically to the campus (See Table 9). A typical college in the South or North Central area is more likely to have a larger number of clergy assigned to its campus on a full-time basis than is a Northeastern or Western school.

The majority of American public colleges responding to the 1968 survey reported the existence of a campus minister's council. However, one-half of these apparently have membership from only a portion of the ministers serving the campus. As the exclusive basis for the university's relationship with ministers, these councils would seem to present difficulties. Again regional differences are evident. North Central colleges which responded to this question reported the highest percentage of schools served by such councils. Only colleges in the Middle States reported that fewer than 45 percent were served by such councils. Since the 1968 study was limited primarily to university provision for religious affairs, the functions of these ministerial groups other than their use by the university for recognition of or communication with ministers were not investigated.

Do clear channels of communication exist between campus clergy and university administration? Hammond, in his study of campus clergy at both public and private colleges, found that four-fifths of the campus clergy per-

TABLE 8
DUTIES OF ADVISORS TO RELIGIOUS COUNCILS
1968

Do his duties include–	Middle States		New England		North Central		Northwest		Southern		Western		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Program advisement–yes	4	4.8	5	6.0	37	44.0	5	6.0	29	34.5	4	4.8	84	100.1
Financial advisement–yes	2	4.3	4	8.5	19	40.4	2	4.3	19	40.4	1	2.1	47	100.0
Direct programming–yes	1	2.5	2	5.0	22	55.0	1	2.5	14	35.0	0	–	40	100.0
Research and evaluation–yes	0	–	1	2.6	18	46.2	2	5.1	17	43.6	1	2.6	39	100.1

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF MINISTERS EMPLOYED BY RELIGIOUS GROUPS TO WORK AT PUBLIC COLLEGES
1968

Percentage of Time Devoted to the Campus	Number of Clergy per Campus					
	1	2-4	5-10	11-	No Answer	Total
67-100%	31	81	48	24	89	273
	11%	30%	18%	9%	32%	100%
34-66%	40	39	9	3	182	273
	15%	14%	3%	1%	67%	100%
1-33%	29	72	34	6	132	273
	11%	26%	13%	2%	48%	100%
Colleges Responding	31	81	48	24	89	273

ceived a regular channel.[5] Whether this was due to the official designation of an officer by the university or to an unofficial or informal arrangement was not indicated. The following question was asked to obtain data for the 1968 study: "Is a member of the university staff designated as liaison person with ministers?" (See Table 10).

Two out of five of the public colleges and universities in 1968 officially named a person for liaison with campus ministers. By 1972 this had increased to two out of three. Wide regional variations were evident. The colleges in the Southern region supported this practice to a far greater extent than did colleges in other areas. New England and Northwest colleges were least likely to do this. In fact, the practice of Southern colleges varied so greatly from the average that the Southern region was the only region which was significantly above the average for all colleges.

The data seemed also to indicate that the naming of an officer as liaison with campus ministers is positively related to the number of campus ministers assigned to serve the campus. New England and Northwest colleges reported the smallest numbers of campus clergy per campus, whereas the other regions reported significantly higher numbers of clergy per campus. A hypothesis, which should be tested further, is that when clergy assigned to a campus number five or less, informal channels of communication are adequate. When the number exceeds five, more formal lines of communication are needed, and universities tend to identify specific officers for liaison with campus clergy.

What do these liaison officers with campus clergy do? The data indicate that these officers functioned in 1968 basically to facilitate the work of the campus clergy. Almost all assisted with access to the campus, aided in program planning, and served as a communications link between other university staff and the campus clergy. More than half, in addition, distributed religious preference information and utilized clergy in programs which they sponsor. Thirty-seven, or 31 percent, of these officers had responsibility for administering a facility housing the offices or programs of the clergy. This latter function was most common at Northeastern and Southern institutions.

University-Sponsored Programs

Direct responsibility for cocurricular programs about religion is generally not accepted by American public colleges and universities. One-eighth of the responding institutions in 1968 indicated that they did take a major responsibility for certain programs of a religious nature. Another one-fourth assumed an advisory responsibility for programs planned by others, presumably students. This percentage is consistent with the data previously cited on the number of colleges which named advisors to student religious councils. Significantly, almost one-third of those responding did not answer this section of the inquiry.

[5] Phillip E. Hammond, *The Campus Clergyman* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966), p. 93.

TABLE 10

UNIVERSITY STAFF SERVING AS LIAISON WITH CAMPUS MINISTERS

1968

	Middle States		New England		North Central		Northwest		Southern		Western		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes, works with council	4	12	4	17	28	29	4	17	23	31	3	14	66	24
Yes, works with individuals	9	27	3	13	15	16	2	9	18	24	6	29	53	19
Total, Yes	13	39	7	30	43	45	6	26	41	55	9	43	119	43

Lectures, seminars, and discussion groups on religious topics; concerts of a religious nature; and counseling regarding religious matters are the most frequent types of religious programs sponsored directly by public colleges and universities. Programs which involve definite practices of specific religions such as worship services, observances of religious holy days, and religious retreats are generally not sponsored by state colleges and universities or by their staff members when acting in official capacity. When these latter programs do occur on public college campuses, the official involvement of the university seems to be limited to advisement or facilitation.

Differences in the practices of colleges on the basis of geographical location are again evident. Institutions in the Southern region reveal the greatest tendency, approximately one-fifth, to sponsor directly such programs about religion and to assign the responsibility to a university staff person. A strong relationship is also evident between university sponsorship of programs and the age of the institution. The highest percentages of institutions sponsoring religious programs are found in the oldest categories. For example, 37 percent of the institutions founded before 1865 report lecture-concert series on religious topics. The percentage declines sharply in relation to the age of the school.

Little relationship was found between the size of institutions and university sponsorship of programs about religion. The exception was religious emphasis weeks. Almost all such programs in 1968 were reported by the medium-size institutions—those between 1,000 and 10,000 in enrollment.

When universities do accept some responsibility for programs dealing with religion, to whom on their staffs do they assign this responsibility? The data revealed no commonly accepted pattern. The most frequent response was another officer. At least on a number of campuses, ministers employed by religious agencies are given a quasi-official responsibility for some programs carrying university sponsorship. This tendency was most frequent in the New England and Middle States regions.

A second group of colleges, when assuming the responsibility of cocurricular programs about religion, employ specialized personnel for this purpose. This was most frequent in those regions reporting the highest percentages of university sponsored programs about religions. From one-fourth to one-third of the Southern, North Central, and Middle States colleges responding in 1968 indicated that they utilize a director of religious activities or a chaplain for this purpose. In the Western regions, when these programs receive university support, it is most frequently in the form of advisement by a member of the dean of students staff. Only rarely were faculty members reported serving in this capacity. Even with growing numbers of faculty in religious studies in public colleges, apparently very few have official responsibility for cocurricular religious programs.

Provision of Physical Facilities for Religious Affairs

Specialized facilities for religious affairs generally are not provided by America's public colleges and universities. Only 44 (16 percent of those responding) in 1968 indicated that a separate building for religious purposes is provided on campus. Another 28, or 10 percent, stated that such a building was currently in some degree of consideration. The 1972 survey revealed that few if any of these buildings had materialized.

Apparently the majority of these buildings are chapel buildings with limited facilities for functions other than worship. Approximately one-half in addition have office space for either university staff or ministers. A similar percentage provides library-study, kitchen-dining, and lounge areas. In the 1972 survey only one-eighth of those responding reported that administration of a building for religious purposes was a university function.

Colleges in the Middle States, North Central, and Southern regions are most likely to have these buildings; those on the Pacific Coast are least likely. The highest frequency reported was in the Middle States, where one-fourth of the colleges report such a facility. Also, more of these facilities exist at the older and larger institutions. In fact, more than 50 percent of those institutions founded prior to 1865 have such buildings.

These data seem to indicate that the majority of the religious facilities owned by the public colleges are more significant historically or symbolically than functionally. The kinds of on-going programs which public colleges most frequently sponsor (lectures, discussion groups, service projects) would not seem to require a building with special religious facilities.

Although a specific college-owned religious facility is not essential to the work of a religious affairs officer, the presence of a special building for religious activities seems to be related to the naming of staff to be responsible for religious affairs. One-third of these buildings are located on campuses at which a staff member devotes 50 percent or more of his time to religious affairs. Apparently, the thinking seems to be that if someone has to be responsible for these buildings, he might as well do something else in the religious sphere while he is at it.

Facilities for specific religious practices, such as worship, seem to be considered by the vast majority of America's public colleges to be solely the responsibility of religious agencies. Only one-eighth of the institutions in 1968 indicated that they provide assistance to religious groups in finding locations in accord with the university master plan or zoning. Assistance other than occasional counsel regarding building locations is virtually nonexistent. Only two colleges, in the Southern region, reported leasing ground upon which religious groups could build their own buildings. None indicated that they had sold land to religious groups in order for them to build their own buildings.

Generally no specific university officer is assigned responsibility for assisting religious organizations with physical facilities. Even when this is done, no

general pattern seems to exist. Table 11 shows the range of titles given. Over half of the surveyed institutions did not respond to this area of inquiry. Many institutions could identify no specific officer with this function.

In summary, university-owned buildings for religious purposes are the exception at America's public colleges. When they do exist, these tend to be at the older and larger schools and seem to have more historical or symbolic than functional significance. The burden of obtaining specialized physical facilities for religious functions at the public colleges rests almost entirely with the religious organizations. Any assistance from universities seems to be in the form of advice and then upon initiative of the religious groups. This seems to be the area in which the public universities' sources and procedures for help to religious organizations and personnel is least clearly defined.

Religious Counseling

The one conclusion of this study regarding religious counseling is that this responsibility is assumed by most public colleges and universities. Few campuses make clear distinctions between religious and other types of counseling and therefore specialized or clearly identifiable staff for this function would be held to be unnecessary. The policy statement of one school which does appears as Appendix B.

Staff for Religious Coordination

Even as the several religious coordination functions are provided for in varying degrees by America's 505 four-year public colleges and universities, so the assignment of staff for these functions at the 273 colleges responding in 1968 reveals great variation (See Table 11). As has been noted previously, responsibility for relating to student religious organizations and campus clergy were the two most frequently accepted functions in both the 1968 and 1972 studies. Judging from the personnel who performed these responsibilities, liaison with religious groups and personnel is clearly perceived to be a student personnel function.

No such consensus exists in regard to the other functions defined as religious coordination. Nearly half of the institutions responding in 1968 did report some on-campus, university-sponsored religious activities. On a number of campuses, these functions were the direct responsibility of a university officer; whereas on other campuses, a student religious council or a ministerial group seems to be responsible. When these activities were the responsibility of a university officer, he was most frequently a member of the student affairs staff, often a specialized religious affairs officer. On several campuses nonuniversity personnel, such as campus ministers, were recognized for these responsibilities.

Generally the university officer who works with religious groups in regard to physical facilities is not a member of the student personnel staff. Wherever a university does provide such a building, the person in charge may be a

TABLE 11

UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL WITH RELIGIOUS COORDINATION RESPONSIBILITIES

1968

N = 273	Chief Student Personnel Officer No.	%	Assistant Student Personnel Dean No.	%	Dean of Student Activities No.	%	Director of Religious Activities No.	%	YMCA or YWCA Secretary No.	%	Chaplain No.	%	Faculty Member No.	%	Other No.	%	No One No.	%	Not Indicated No.	%
University officer responsible for relationships to student religious organizations	83	30.4	34	12.5	34	12.5	41	15.0	1	0.4	7	2.6	2	0.7	30	11.0	8	2.9	33	12.1
University officer responsible for university-sponsored programs of a religious nature	22	8.1	17	6.2	8	2.9	30	11.0	2	0.7	7	2.6	4	1.5	41	15.0	4	1.5	138	50.5
University officer with religious council designated to work	16	5.9	9	3.3	5	1.8	22	8.1	0	–	3	1.1	12	4.4	17	6.2	2	0.7	187	68.5
University officer designated as liaison with ministers	31	11.4	18	6.6	12	4.4	33	12.1	1	0.4	4	1.5	1	0.4	17	6.2	0	–	156	57.1
University officer responsible for working with physical facilities for religious groups	21	7.7	7	2.6	11	4.0	17	6.2	0	–	4	1.5	0	–	46	16.8	12	4.4	155	56.8
University officer responsible for general religious coordination	62	22.7	45	16.5	25	9.2	35	12.8	1	0.4	8	2.9	2	0.7	51	18.7	0	–	44	16.1

member of the student personnel staff generally carrying also some program functions.

A case study approach of selected institutions is necessary to delineate clearly among the several types of organizational arrangements and personnel assignments utilized by public colleges in providing for religious coordination. These are reported in Chapter 4.

What are the reasons state universities employ personnel for religious affairs? The 1968 survey provided some clues although this question was not asked specifically. A number of colleges, apparently believing that certain programs about religion were important in the total cocurricular offerings for students, employed personnel to be responsible for these programs or for working with students and others who are responsible. Problems of educational adequacy and student relevance could thereby be met. Other colleges apparently found that they needed someone to be responsible for liaison with the growing numbers of ministers assigned to or working on their campuses. Difficulties in communications and conflicts in activities could be surmounted by such personnel. In addition, a few colleges apparently found themselves with facilities which needed to be used or better supervised for maximum educational benefit. As will be seen in Chapter 5, the job descriptions of religious affairs personnel vary in emphasis. Apparently on a number of campuses different personnel have responsibility for the different functions; but generally these several personnel report to the dean of students on their campuses.

Resources Available to Religious Coordinators

Another way of ascertaining institutional commitment to religious coordination is to determine the resources made available to the personnel assigned to this function. Specific questions were asked in the 1968 study regarding the number of professional assistants, clerical assistants, and graduate or student assistants as well as budget allocations. Secretarial assistance was most common, being reported by 15 percent. Twenty-five reported a member of the professional staff assisting them. Eddy found only seven institutions which reported more than one full-time professional staff member.[6] The 1968 study found a number of part-time people indicating that they have assistance in religious coordination. This observation is consistent with one made previously that on a number of campuses, religious coordination functions are assigned to several staff people who report to the chief student personnel officer who answered this questionnaire. Approximately 10 percent of the schools reported a student assistant deployed in religious affairs and 5 percent reported graduate students in similar capacities. A higher percentage of the personnel devoting full or nearly full-time to religious affairs (17 percent) reported graduate assistants for religious coordination than did the part-time personnel (3 percent). Likewise, a much higher percentage of the full-time personnel

[6] John Paul Eddy, *op. cit.*

(55 percent) reported special secretarial assistance for religious affairs than did the part-time personnel (5 percent).

Budgets

Few of the part-time personnel were able in the 1968 study to report on the size of their budget for religious affairs responsibilities. One from a Southern college simply wrote, "no separate item." Altogether, personnel from sixty colleges gave specific budget amounts allocated for religious affairs. Nearly one-half of these reported budgets amounting to less than $2,000. Six reported budgets of $30,000 or more. Eleven reported budgets between $16,000 and $30,000. These seventeen were located in those regions (Middle States, North Central, and Southern) reporting the largest number of full-time coordinators, separate buildings for religious affairs, and college sponsorship of certain religious programs.

Location of Offices

Predominately, persons with religious coordination responsibility were officed in 1968 in administration buildings of colleges and universities. Those regions which reported separate buildings for religious purposes again were the only ones reporting religious coordination staff housed in special religious affairs buildings.

Trends in University Provision for Religious Coordination

The chief trend which can be detected by comparing the present studies with the previous studies cited is that the practice of religion appears increasingly to be viewed as a personal rather than an official college matter. Provision for programs of a religious nature seems more and more to be the responsibility of the individual or agencies in the private sector. The area of cocurricular study about religion has not been clearly distinguished from the practice of religion and therefore has not been as strongly supported by the public colleges and universities as has been the academic study of religion.

These trends can be seen in the demise of religious emphasis weeks. Beginning in the forties, the Department of Evangelism of the National Council of Churches provided colleges assistance in conducting religious emphasis weeks. The idea was to provide sufficient funds for speakers and program consultation so that all colleges could have such a program once every four years. It was hoped that in the interim many colleges would mobilize local resources for such weeks. A full-orbed religious emphasis week featured college-wide convocation speakers, specialists who could speak in classes on the relation of their faith to the particular disciplines, discussion groups in the organized areas of student life, and opportunities for personal conferences with the visiting leaders. Planning groups, frequently called religious councils on many campuses, worked throughout the year planning for and following up

the one week of major emphasis. In some cases, special university staff advisors were employed or utilized.

Although one of the original goals of the National Council of Churches in inaugurating such programs was motivating Christian commitment, the emphasis on the importance of religion in all aspects of life was believed to be of value to other faiths as well. This made possible the inclusion of leadership from all major faiths and provided what was thought to be the necessary basis for university sponsorship. Mixed together then were concerns for adequate college attention to the study of religion and the desire of the several faiths to secure the commitment of college students.

By the late fifties criticism had mounted from both the church and the college regarding the propriety and effectiveness of such efforts.[7] Support by the National Council of Churches was discontinued. By the mid-sixties an obituary could be published in the prestigious Protestant journal, *The Christian Century*.[8]

These studies reveal that such endeavors, although declining, are not completely dead. To what degree the purposes and means have been transformed to fit changing conditions of campus life was not determined by these studies. The kinds of programs which continue to be officially sponsored seem to be those aspects of religious emphasis weeks which do not involve the practice of religion. Examples are lectures, discussion series, concerts, and arts festivals.

The number of colleges (92) reporting religious emphasis weeks in 1968 was almost identical with the number (91) reporting campus religious councils which "plan and implement on-campus programs to educate about religion." This percentage (22 percent) is little more than half the number of councils found by Crouch near the beginning of the decade. Only colleges in Southern and North Central regions still report a significant number of such events. By 1972 only 13 percent of those responding reported an interfaith council. The Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs during the first half of the sixties conducted a series of regional student conferences. Those attending were generally from colleges with religious councils. The fact that these meetings were discontinued in the mid-sixties further corroborates the decline in the number of religious councils and religious emphasis weeks.

The supposition may be made that many of these councils remaining are in fact Christian ecumenical coordinating groups functioning primarily to conduct programs involving several of the Christian groups on campus. This hypotheses is supported by the fact that in several cases a minister, generally the one employed by ecumenical Protestants, rather than a university employee, returned the 1968 questionnaire.

A trend may also be observed regarding dissemination of religious pref-

[7] Denis Baly, *Academic Illusion* (Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1961), p. 177.
[8] John E. Cantelon, "Whatever Happened to Religious Emphasis Week?" *The Christian Century*, LXXXII, 396-398.

erence information by comparing the 1968 and 1972 studies. Of the 263 institutions responding to both surveys, approximately one-third reported such a practice in 1968; whereas in 1972 some 20 additional institutions reported this practice. This may reflect the fact that public colleges are now collecting this information to prove that they do not discriminate; whereas the opposite practice was earlier thought to accomplish this result.

Implications for Student Personnel Administration

The decline in officially sponsored cocurricular programs in religion stands in contrast to the growth in curricular programs in religion.[9] The notable curricular development during the decade of the sixties in the academic study of religion by American state universities provided also an educational rationale as an alternative to the aid-to-religion rationale for cocurricular religious programs.[10] The fact that cocurricular programs in religion declined during the sixties may indicate that little use of an educational rationale in fact occurred. Apparently in the cocurriculum the distinction between the practice of and the study of a religion has not been made by most university staff. The fact that most university-sponsored programs continue to be at the colleges and universities which have the longest traditions or which have buildings of historical significance suggests that on many campuses university-sponsored programs continue to be motivated by the desire to aid religion. If this confusion of purpose regarding cocurricular programs in religion is as real as these studies suggest, then the lack of development in this area is understandable. Implications of this conclusion for the future of a professional student personnel specialty in the area of religious activities is frightening. In the best of times, the financial resources for areas which are not essential to the functioning of an institution hold low priority. When fiscal austerity pervades, those positions are the first to be dropped or to go unfilled when vacancies normally occur. Religious coordination then seems to be a field in desperate need of forceful communication of a clear rationale for its work and guidelines for involving the resources of the obviously interested religious groups in the official university cocurriculum if it is to continue as a student personnel specialty.

This study also raises questions regarding the adequacy of the current structures within public universities for liaison with religious forces. Dramatic changes, such as the Jesus movement and the rise of interest in Eastern religious and the occult, are taking place in the religious practices of students. Equally significant changes in the religious institutions seem to be at best only partially understood by university administration and faculty. Traditional student religious organizations seem to be in decline. Present on most campuses is a cadre of professionally trained campus clergy who are nevertheless

[9] Milton McLean (ed) his book, *Religious Studies in Public Universities* (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1967), documents the development of curricular programs in religious studies.

[10] George W. Jones, "A Rationale for Religious Programming in State Universities," *Journal of College Student Personnel*, VIII (November, 1967), 385-389.

threatened by lack of identity and recognition in the university in which they are supposed to be working and by declining support, in many cases, from their church constituencies.

The chief recommendation of the Danforth Foundation Study of Campus Ministries[11] in the mid-sixties was that the direction of the campus ministry be changed and that new structures be developed whereby the critical inquiry of the university can be fused with the ethical vision of the religious communities. The lack of response of the university personnel to this study indicates little recognition of the forces of change in the religious life on their campuses.

Only a few of the university personnel responding to this study revealed the insight necessary to capture the potential of closer coordination of the university curriculum and cocurriculum with the programs of religious practice. One dean wrote the following statement, which was exceptional: "Student [religious] centers [can] take the initiative to work with university personnel in programming for activities that benefit the general development of students. . . . At best, the university should encourage student religious centers to develop—for their own and the universities' use—tangent programs of social action and intellectual development not so 'religious' oriented as 'value development' oriented. Such programs, training, or speakers can do much to supplement an area in which current university programming is *very* weak." This dean saw an educational need which campus religious forces could uniquely meet. This study found few on the public universities' staffs in a position to encourage or utilize such cooperation.

SUMMARY

Organized religious life and practices at American public colleges and universities shifted increasingly into the private sector during the decade of the sixties. Almost every public college reported student religious groups and personnel sponsored by religious bodies. Officially sponsored cocurricular programs about religion seem to have declined as curricular programs expanded.

Campus religious councils with university sanction whose function was to promote specific religious practices and commitments decreased in number. Of the religious councils which remained, some apparently were, in effect, service agencies for the religious groups. Others seemed to function primarily as Christian ecumenical groups, conducting programs with the assistance of the clergy from some of the Christian groups on campus.

Attitudes of university administrators reveal that too much initiative on the part of the campus clergy in campus programming is likely to be met with suspicion and distrust on many campuses. Here perhaps is a task for that small number of university staff—the "full-time" coordinators of religious affairs. Because of training and experience, they are in a unique position to provide

[11] Kenneth Underwood, *op. cit.*, 478.

leadership not only on their own campuses but also through national professional associations to the larger number of student personnel professionals who find themselves with religious coordination responsibilities but with little preparation for the task.

Approximately two-thirds of the public colleges and universities in 1972 accepted responsibility for relating to student religious organizations and liaison with campus clergy. Advisement of cocurricular programs about religion and advisement of a religious coordinating council were accepted by one-third of the colleges in 1968 but only one-sixth in 1972. The degree of responsibility for the several functions ranged from total planning to advising others.

Staff persons fulfilling these roles presented a wide variety of job titles but generally were in the student affairs area of their colleges. On several campuses more than one officer under the direction of a dean of students were utilized, whereas on other campuses a single officer had more comprehensive responsibility for religious coordination.

The most consistent patterns of assignment of personnel were found at two types of schools—those accepting a large measure of responsibility for direct sponsorship of the various religious functions and those limiting their responsibility simply to maintaining lines of communication with student religious organizations and in some cases also with campus ministers. The first group (approximately 15 percent of the total number of colleges) tended to employ specialized personnel giving them most frequently the title of director or coordinator of religious affairs. The second group (approximately 50 percent of the total number of colleges) generally expected the chief personnel officer or one of his assistants, frequently the one in student activities, to perform the functions of communication, liaison, and advisement.

Other colleges which accepted a high degree of responsibility for some functions and little or no responsibility for others often reported two or more officers with responsibility for different religious coordination functions. One officer might be, for example, assigned as advisor to a religious council and another be made responsible for liaison with campus ministers.

Chapter 4

Precedents for Adjudication: What Models of Religious Coordination Are Available?

The conditions for settlement between the contending forces in religious life at America's public institutions of higher education reflect traditions and models available in each local situation. Patterns of provision for a cocurriculum in religion are almost as diverse as the colleges themselves. Each is a unique institution. Each differs to some degree in its setting, its emphases, and its organization. Statistical treatment of data obscures this individuality. This chapter describes fifteen representative programs which illustrate variations of four basic approaches American public colleges have followed in providing for a religious cocurriculum.

First, a number of institutions seek to have no relationship with activities, organizations, and personnel considered to be religious. Religious functions are held to be strictly off-campus, even beyond the knowledge of the university. Following this approach a college considers its own responsibility to be limited to those aspects of student development which are most directly related to the institution's purposes. In order to maintain this separation between education and religion, an attitude of hostility may sometimes be observed.

A second group of public colleges, the majority in fact, recognizes that the religion of a person cannot be absolutely separated from the education of that person; however, provision for the religious needs of that person is more the responsibility of religious agencies than it is of the educational institution. These colleges, therefore, provide a point of contact and communication through one of the general student affairs officers. A specialized religious affairs officer is not considered essential although one might be desirable. These institutions generally grant recognition to student religious organizations and provide the same advisory services to these groups which they do for other types of student organizations. Some of these also grant recognition to the ministers assigned by religious agencies to their campuses.

A smaller third group of institutions apparently takes the position that since study about religion was ruled constitutional in the curriculum of the secondary schools, a related cocurriculum in religion also has a place on their campuses. These colleges have employed, generally on a part-time basis, officers to assist with cocurricular programs. Most often it is one of the student affairs staff who has had some specialized training in religious affairs. Frequently one of the faculty in religion is assigned to this responsibility. Occasionally it is a campus minister. On a few campuses the advisor

for the religious cocurriculum is a different officer from the one who has responsibility for liaison with religious groups and ministers.

In a fourth group of approximately thirty-five campuses, full-time officers are employed on student affairs staff with the responsibility for many if not all of the following functions relating to religion: liaison with campus ministers, advising student religious organizations, religious counseling, conducting cocurricular programs about religion and administering special buildings for religious purposes. A few campuses provide a professional staff of two or more to work in these areas.

Among these full-time religious affairs officers a variety of approaches or emphases may be observed. Charles Minneman, past president of the national Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs, in his visits to colleges campuses and conversations with almost all of the full-time religious affairs personnel, identified five basic models of religious coordination.

The oldest approach going back to the days of established Protestant religion in state colleges is the *chaplaincy* model. Few chaplaincies exist in state colleges today except as has been noted in some of the military and Negro institutions. Generally a chapel building, regular chapel services, and counseling are important aspects of this approach to religious programs.

A second model ties the cocurricular to the curricular and was called by Minneman the *religious studies* model. Priority here is on the academic study of religion. Cocurricular programming may be done by one of the staff or through a departmental student club. Examples of this model exist at universities with strong, prestigious departments or schools of religious studies.

Programs focusing on *university governance*, according to Minneman, tend to be staffed by educators who emphasize their student personnel roles. They seek to utilize administrative resources in the development of cocurricular programs about religion.

Another group of institutions emphasizing the *human relations* aspects of religion have found relevancy in initiating programs for groups which might be otherwise neglected or which have special needs in relating to the university. Experience of religious affairs staff in working with religiously pluralistic situations is tapped in programming for the many forms of cultural pluralism found on the majority of American campuses today. Such programs may be structured under a human resources center of which religious affairs is a part.

A few institutions are probing in a fifth direction, developing what might be called a *social policy* model. Focusing on ethical issues in the larger society, these offices of religious affairs seek to bring together the technical skills and knowledge of various units of the college and the ethical vision and moral fervor of the religious agencies related to the university through the office. An action-research approach to special problems is projected toward concerns from local community to overseas countries. Minneman has outlined these models as shown in Appendix C.

These differences in approach perhaps can best be seen by the consideration of programs at specific campuses. The following case studies were selected because they illustrated in 1968 the full spectrum of approaches to religious coordination implemented at America's public colleges and universities.

College A

At a state college with 7,200 students in a suburb in a Northeastern metropolitan area, the officer who declined to identify himself, maintained that "separation of church and state prevails." No provision is made for recognition of student religious organizations or of campus ministers. Such groups may reserve space on campus "for meetings *about* [emphasis in the original] religions—no services on campus." A note of hostility was present in his comment, "Students resent the push of the church onto campuses where there is a captive audience." He concluded that current attitudes of students toward religion would cause churches to "lose more and more out of the church program where it [worship and evangelistic services] belongs and they [churches] will continue increasing pressure, pressure, pressure to move in on campus."

College B

The Vice President and Dean of Students at another Northeastern state college with an enrollment of 6,000 identified himself as the one responsible for relationships with student organizations and with the six campus ministers who serve the campus. Although there are no officially sponsored religious programs as such, student religious organizations are recognized in the same manner as other student organizations. These groups may hold meetings on campus, use campus publicity media, and obtain a campus mailbox. A campus religious council sponsors such events as Thanksgiving Convocation, the religious phase of new student orientation, and interfaith retreats. The Vice President also works with the ministers through a ministerial council to distribute religious preference information, prepare publications on religious life in the university, assist with the in-service training of ministers, and to interpret the work of the ministers to the university. The university works with the religious groups in providing their own buildings and is currently discussing an on-campus religious center for all groups. The most difficult problem which the Vice President said he faces in religious affairs is "interpreting an ambiguous legal question regarding church-state relationships."

College C

At a Midwestern "emerging" university of 6,000 students, the director of student activities is responsible for coordinating and advising all student governmental, social, and recreational activities and all campus organizations including seven religious organizations. These groups are recognized as are

other groups after filing an application, submitting a constitution, and selecting a faculty sponsor. They are given an organizational mailbox, use of campus publicity media, and meeting space on campus. The director of student activities is working with these groups to form a coordinating council. Four of the groups are served by full-time campus ministers who have no official relationship to the university but use the director of student activities as their chief contact person. Through this relationship, religious preference information is secured, and ministers are aided in planning programs on campus and in gaining access for calling in residence halls. The director of student activities seeks to interpret to other university officers the work of the religious groups and the ministers. He estimates that about five percent of his time is spent in religious affairs. A Roman Catholic layman, he wishes he had more training in this area. He holds a doctorate in student personnel administration and teaches in the university's student personnel graduate program.

College D

Founded in the 1890s, University D in a Western state now has an enrollment of approximately 20,000. The Associate Dean of Students is the administrative officer responsible for relationships with religious organizations and leaders. A campus minister for twenty-eight years on the campus, the dean has had theological training and holds an earned doctorate in sociology from a German university. Roughly six percent of his time is spent with religious organizations and personnel. Liaison with thirty campus ministers consumes the majority of the time which he devotes to religious affairs. Thus, he is the chief advisor for such on-campus programs which the ministers plan as a lecture series on religion, religious seminars and study groups, and radio and TV programs. Fourteen religious organizations are recognized in the same manner and are accorded the same privileges as other groups. The dean has one secretary who assists in his religious coordination work. The greatest challenge he sees in his work is "creating programs *on campus* to dignify and make relevant religion to college students." He states that students committed to religion tend to get their religious needs met within their own student religious group off-campus.

College E

At a Pacific-Coast state college with 11,000 enrollment, which became a four-year tax-supported institution since World War II, religious coordination functions are generally the responsibility of the dean of students but are distributed among several of his staff. The administrative assistant to the dean filled out the questionnaire because "I usually respond to questionnaires of this type." Stating that he had no religious preference, he saw his responsibility for religious affairs as being "informational," "communications," and "working on special projects." Chief responsibility for relating to

student religious organizations and personnel is delegated to the student activities office. "The activities staff work with these groups—primarily student clubs with 'off-campus' minister, priest, or rabbi's advisement—as it does with any other campus organization concerning facilities, program advisement, publicity, etc. These off-campus ministers, *etc.* work closely with other areas of the campus in somewhat a semi-official capacity—areas such as housing, counseling, etc." The ministers apparently name one of their number to be a coordinator for their relationships with the university. This is probably done by the campus ministers' council although it was not so stated on the questionnaire. This council also conducts cooperatively on campus, with college advisement, programs which include religious emphasis week, a lecture series, discussion groups, and service projects.

College F

The faculty chairman of a Southern state college's Religious Activities Committee has chief responsibility for advising on-campus religious programs such as Religious Emphasis Week, Easter services, and special speakers and discussion groups on religious topics. Although having earned a degree from a theological seminary, he is not ordained and is an instructor in one of the science departments. He is also a member of the board and faculty advisor for one of the student religious organizations. The Religious Activities Committee has a budget of $500 for its activities and reports to the Vice President through the Student Personnel Advisory Committee. Of the one percent of his time which he estimates he devotes to religious affairs, approximately one-half is spent with the five campus ministers who serve the campus and who apparently take much of the initiative for the on-campus programs. The six student religious organizations on campus find their primary relationship to the campus through the office of student activities. These groups may hold meetings on campus and utilize campus publicity media. A religious council composed of representatives from all student religious organizations distributes religious preference information and conducts some on-campus programs. The relationship between the Religious Activities Committee and the religious council is not clear from the questionnaire. Judging from the overlap of activities they may be one and the same. With the religious program apparently dominated by institutional religious interests it was not surprising to read that the most difficult problem is "student participation."

College G

At a Northern state university enrolling 7,000 students, the vice president for student affairs has designated the nine campus ministers assigned to the campus as a division of the student personnel staff. One of the campus ministers is recognized as chairman. The campus ministers emphasize their function as a ministry team rather than their role as advisors to student religious organizations. One of the perceptions they are attempting to over-

come is "the assumption that 'religious affairs' and 'student religious organizations' typify the churches' ministry in higher education." The fact that the ministers are made to feel they can function as "a part of the University" is apparently very important to the self-concepts of the ministers, at least to the one who filled out the questionnaire. As members of the university staff they may hold meetings on campus but are not provided office space. Salaries and program expense money are entirely from church sources.

College H

Another approach to recognizing ministers employed by churches is exemplified at an urban university in the Upper Ohio Valley. Nearly all of the 15,000 students commute. A Catholic priest and a Protestant minister are assigned to the campus on a full-time basis. These are "recognized officially as chaplains with the rank of limited service faculty" and are provided office space. The chaplains work with the two officially recognized student religious organizations—one Protestant and one Catholic. A lecture series is the only officially sponsored religious program; however, the chaplains working with the student religious organizations sponsor a number of other activities. Social service and community action projects are the main endeavors of the chaplains' offices. Some opportunity for classroom teaching is also provided the chaplains. Because of the nature of the campus, little time is spent in conducting worship services. About one-third of the chaplains' efforts are devoted to counseling.

College I

At a Northwestern state university with 12,000 students the campus YMCA Executive Secretary, who is salaried in part by the university and officed in the university union building, functions as a fourth-time coordinator of religious affairs. He is provided little budget and no staff for this work. As "Y" director, he is responsible for a university lecture series on religion and the many study and service projects. He seeks to coordinate the activities of eight student religious organizations which are recognized by the university and which may hold meetings on campus and the efforts of sixteen campus ministers who have an informal relationship with the university through the YMCA office. Through a council of ministers he distributes religious preference information, advises and secures access for ministers for their on-campus activities and seeks to interpret their work to other university officers. One-half of his time in religious affairs is spent in counseling. He sees his work basically to be that of an educator, facilitator, and reconciler. In his fifties, he is something of an institution having served in his present position more than twenty-five years. Formal training for his work has been largely through workshops. He served as an associate "Y" director at his undergraduate college for two years immediately upon graduation. His most difficult problem, he says, is maintaining harmony among the ministers.

College J

This New England university utilizes a former secretary at the university as a half-time director of religious affairs for the nine months of the academic year. Administratively she reports to the Director of Student Services and is officed in the college union building. Six student religious organizations have recognized status and are members of an interfaith association which plans a wide variety of on-campus religious programs. The university recognizes seven ministers as the official advisors of the student religious organizations. The director for religious affairs is advisor for the interfaith association and estimates that she spends 75 percent of her time with students in program planning or counseling. In her liaison capacity with ministers, the director distributes religious preference information and prepares publications on religious life at the university. A Unitarian-Universalist, the director is of the opinion that her knowledge of the university, her availability, and her ability to work with students and ministers are her important qualifications for the position. She holds a bachelor's degree in business and admits that "occasionally" she feels the need for training in religious affairs.

College K

This state university with an enrollment of over 25,000 illustrates an approach to religious coordination which centers in a chapel building with Sunday chapel services and offices for the campus ministers. Formerly the university had an officer called simply the university chaplain. Approximately ten years ago the title was changed to Coordinator of Religious Affairs and the office made responsible to the Vice President for Student Affairs. A Jewish layman was employed to be in charge. A full-time assistant, a Black Protestant clergyman, directs the chapel program. The university music department is also heavily involved in the chapel program. The current coordinator holds a doctorate in student personnel administration.

Fifteen student religious organizations and the work of some twenty campus clergy are related to the university through the office of the coordinator. These ministers have official designation as religious affairs staff and are utilized in a residence hall counseling program in cooperation with the dean of students office.

The coordinator sees his role to be one of facilitator, initiator, resource person, and interpreter. Through the chapel program he has direct responsibility for weekly worship services, special lectures and concerts of religious concern, and the several ceremonial occasions for the university, such as baccalaureate. His major function is direction of the efforts of his staff and the campus ministers who are involved in the programs of the chapel. The annual budget available to him is over $50,000. The chapel building, now over twenty years old, would require approximately $1,000,000 to replace at current costs. A trend he noted on his campus was unapologetic participation in religious oriented activities by students.

College L

At this land-grant university in the upper Midwest, one of the professors of religious studies is assigned one-fourth time to religious affairs and has the additional title of Coordinator of Religious Affairs. Twelve campus ministers, five of whom are full-time, work on this campus of 6,000 students. The coordinator is responsible for relations with the twelve student religious organizations which on this campus may secure office space in addition to other privileges from the university. He serves as advisor to the Religious Council which coordinates ten of the religious groups in such efforts as religious emphasis week, lectures and discussions series, concerts, interfaith retreats, and the religious phase of new student orientation. In his work with the ministers, the coordinator distributes religious preference information and aids them in gaining access to the campus. An important function is "interpretation between the university and religious groups."

An ordained minister in a Protestant denomination, the coordinator holds three degrees, including a Ph.D. in Biblical theology from a theological seminary in the Northeast. His greatest problem is "creating awareness among administrators of the propriety and integrity of this office." As might be expected from this statement, he feels the need for more training in church-university relationships. In keeping with his standing as an instructor, his immediate supervisor is the dean of the college of arts and sciences, and his office is in a faculty office building.

College M

Representative of an institution in which religious coordination is viewed as an integral student personnel phase of education is this state university in the mid-South. The director, a woman in her middle years without theological training but many years of experience as a college instructor and YWCA director, is assisted by a young man with theological training. As the Department of Religious Life in the Division of Student Personnel, the staff is responsible for recognition of the nine student religious organizations and registration of their on-campus activities. Relationships with the nine campus ministers is much less formal; however, office space is provided for some ministers in the Religious Life Building, which was originally the campus YMCA building. Religious emphasis days, special concert series, and discussion groups are conducted by a self-perpetuating committee "representing all areas of the campus, with the director as adviser." The director sees her role as one who communicates and enforces university policies in the areas of religious life. Approximately 60 percent of her time is devoted to liaison functions between various university offices and the campus ministry. Her most difficult problem was reported as "interpreting to newly appointed campus ministers the 'ways' of the state university." As a member of the student affairs staff her salary is commensurate with other salaries in the division. Budget and supportive personnel are "ample."

College N

The Director of Religious Affairs at this university in the upper South indicates that he is pushing the concerns of his office beyond institutional aspects of religion to broader social ethics and human relations concerns. At least 40 percent of his time is devoted to such projects as foreign student advising and the development of community social service projects for students. Nearly one-fifth of his time is involved in working with campus ministers in these kinds of projects. He sees his role to be one of initiator, facilitator, and resource person in these areas. He would be pleased to be thought of as the religious voice in the academic community, seeking to lead the university to take a stand on relevant ethical and social issues.

As director of religious affairs, he is responsible for relationships with the twenty-two student religious organizations serving the campus, the campus ministerial association which includes all seventeen ministers assigned to the campus and development of a program of noncredit courses in religion, religious retreats, and seminars and discussion groups on religion. His office is in the student center where individual student religious organizations may apply for space as do many other student organizations. Such functions as distributing religious preference information and preparation of publications on religious life is done primarily through his relationships with the campus ministers. He aids them in planning in-service training opportunities and in evaluating their work. His graduate work was at a Northeastern theological seminary although he is not an ordained clergyman. He feels the need for more training in fields of social ethics and human relations and is pursuing a doctorate in student personnel administration.

College O

College O is a Midwestern urban university which has responded to campus unrest through major self-studies, realignment of organizations, and hiring of new personnel. The Office of Religious Affairs has been well-established in the university, having had two persons on its professional staff and given leadership to the development of a multimillion dollar University Religious Center attached to the university student center. All twenty religious groups serving the campus as well as the Office of Religious Affairs are housed in this building.

Although working in the Division of Student Personnel, the director has initiated a program of religious studies in the university and a center for theological studies for the metropolitan area which lacks a Protestant seminary.

The vice president for student affairs was recently fired by the new president of the institution. Seeing that justification for expenditures for student affairs programs is being heeded less and less at the university, the director recently proposed restructuring of the religious affairs offices into an academic institute for religion and social problems. Research, teaching, consultation, and social action functions would be combined under "a new framework for

an understanding and reconstruction of those institutions and human relationships to which each religion and the university can contribute, and thus, hopefully, aid in creation of a more humane and democratic society." On a voluntary basis, the campus ministers would be incorporated into the center as directors of issue-oriented task forces, "capable of responding with a high degree of rapidity and flexibility to emerging and identifiable student concerns."

The institute would have an advisory board of faculty, students, and administrators appointed by the president of the university. The institute director would report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research. Interdisciplinary in nature, the institute would draw resources from and provide resources for the several departments concerned with social policy. Implementation of this program awaits substantial funding possibly requiring private and foundation sources in addition to public funds.

Conclusion

These fifteen cases illustrate both the problems involved and the struggles in finding fair approaches to adjudication amongst the parties concerned about religious life on America's public college campuses. Each in its own context has sought a solution to an entanglement of legal issues and educational goals, competition for finances and facilities, availability of qualified staff, and the inevitable conflict between parties both within and without the institution contending for their own interests.

As models, these schools offer educational rationales, programatic approaches, organizational arrangements, position descriptions, and liaison relationships by which the problems relating to religious life on public campuses can be surmounted. No one should be seen as ideal for any other campus. Each represents the compromises which have been practicable among the impinging factors at that location. As a result, to some degree on each campus, students as a part of their total educational opportunities may become better informed about religious options and their possible consequences on their lives.

If one factor seems critical in these arrangements, it has been leadership—often that of one person. When leadership has been present, strong programs have been developed even in regions where other institutions have held back, pleading legal problems. The weaknesses of a thin leadership base were also evident—a tendency toward idiosyncratic programs with high mortality. On the other hand, when leadership has built a strong base in explicit policy statements, an educationally-based operating philosophy, and commitments of finances and facilities, programs have grown and have been able to evolve to meet changing needs even though personalities have come and gone.

Chapter 5

The Executors: Who Is Responsible?

How legal decisions relating to domestic matters are carried out depends upon a special class of citizens assigned to see that judgments are executed. Directors or coordinators of religious affairs occupy similarly strategic positions in maintaining the conditions necessary for fredom and nonestablishment of religion on the public campuses.

One of the major purposes of these studies was to determine who is responsible for the functions defined as religious coordination at American four-year public colleges and universities. This study ascertained, as was reported in Chapter 3, that responsibility for the several religious activities functions is accepted to varying degrees and is assigned to a diversity of staff by America's colleges. Frequently, several officers are utilized for different functions on the same campus. Who on those campuses has responsibility for overall coordination of religious activities?

The questionnaire for the 1968 study was designed not only to provide data to identify the staff who had responsibility for specific religious activities functions but also to describe these personnel. Information about the personal characteristics and responsibilities of these officers was specifically sought. This data is reported and analyzed in this final chapter.

Personnel responsible on public college campuses for overall coordination of religious affairs constitute a population that is bimodal in nature. The two largest groups devote either a considerable amount or very little of their time to religious coordination. Generalizations, therefore, based on averages of the total population would be meaningless (See Table 12). By analyzing the data in terms of two groups—personnel reporting from 0-10 percent of their time (called "part-time" in this report) devoted to religious coordination (N = 140) and those working 50 percent or more of their time (referred to hereafter as "full-time") in religious coordination (N = 42)—a sharply focused picture is available of the personnel engaged in religious coordination in American four-year public colleges and universities in 1968. The data on the full-time group was supplemented by data gathered by John Eddy in 1966 in a study of full-time religious personnel in public colleges.[1] The Eddy data were found to be comparable to that obtained in the present study. Since his data were more complete on this group (58 returns compared to 48 returns) and since the data in the present study were contaminated by the inclusion of information from several campus ministers who, although not employed by

[1] All references to the Eddy study in this chapter may be found in John Paul Eddy, *op. cit.*

colleges, were nevertheless given some direct responsibility by their college for religious coordination, the Eddy data are used in this report where applicable.

Institutional Setting

The data from the 1968 study on the part-time personnel indicates a rather even distribution throughout the range of size of institutions with perhaps a slight concentration in the middle-sized institutions (2,500 to 8,900 total enrollment). Full-time personnel tended to be concentrated in larger (over 10,000 enrollment) and to some degree smaller institutions (under 5,000 enrollment).

TABLE 12
Percentage of Time Devoted to Responsibilities in Religious Coordination

	Number	Percentage
0-5%	122	45
6-10%	18	7
11-15%	8	3
16-20%	6	2
21-25%	8	3
26-34%	3	1
35-49%	3	1
50-74%	15	5
75-100%	27	10
No Answer	63	23
Total	273	

Note: By combining groups it may be seen that of the 210 responding to this question, 140 or 67 percent reported minor or incidental responsibility for religious coordination; 28 of 13 percent reported limited responsibility which in some cases was voluntarily assumed; and 42 or 20 percent reported religious coordination to be a major responsibility, generally reflected in their job titles and descriptions.

Full-time personnel were more likely to be found in institutions which became publicly supported before 1900; whereas, part-time personnel were more frequent in the newer institutions. Full-time personnel also were most frequently reported in the Middle States and Southern regions with significant numbers in the North Central region as well. Part-time personnel were more frequently reported by Pacific Coast institutions. The lowest percentage of personnel with religious affairs assignments were found to be in New England colleges.

Personal Characteristics

The most frequently reported titles for the part-time personnel were those indicating the chief student personnel officer. Fully one-third of this group listed vice president for student affairs, dean of students, or similar terms as their titles. Nearly one-half of the full-time personnel listed their title as director or coordinator of religious affairs. As would be expected from the

consideration of titles, part-time personnel report generally to chief student affairs officers.

Other personal characteristics reflect this difference in title of the personnel. The part-time personnel tended to be slightly older, more frequently held faculty rank, and received higher salaries.

TABLE 13
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO RELIGIOUS COORDINATION
Modal Categories

	Personnel Devoting Less than 10% of Time	Personnel Devoting More than 50% of Time
Title	Vice President for Student Affairs	Director of Religious Affairs
Age	40-44 years	35-39 years
Salary	$15,000 and above	$8,000-$10,900
Faculty Rank	Full Professor	Associate Professor

Women tended to be concentrated in the part-time category, reflecting the fact that nine campuses named the Dean of Women as the person most responsible for religious coordination. Of the forty-two women who responded to the questionnaire, only four gave as much as 50 percent of their time to religious affairs.

One-sixth of the full-time personnel reported their marital status to be single compared to one-tenth of the part-time personnel.

Two-thirds of the full-time personnel reported that they were ordained clergymen whereas only eight percent of the part-time personnel were ordained. One-fourth of the full-time personnel reported that this was a requirement for their present positions compared with only one person indicating that this was true among the part-time personnel. A higher percentage of the ordained clergymen who devote full-time to religious affairs reported previous experience as a pastor of a congregation (two-thirds compared to one-half).

So far as years of tenure in their present positions were concerned, the modal category of both full- and part-time personnel was two to three years. However, more of the full-time personnel were in their first year (10 percent) than was true for the part-time personnel (8 percent). Therefore, the conclusion seems valid that part-time personnel have experienced slightly longer tenure in their current positions than full-time personnel.

Differences were also noticeable in the educational preparation of the two groups. The highest percentage of the part-time group (42 percent) reported holding a doctorate; whereas, only one-fourth of the full-time group reported a doctorate as their highest degree. More frequently the full-time group reported that their highest degree was from a theological seminary (52 percent). Reflecting their student personnel assignments, the part-time personnel most frequently reported degrees in education, psychology, or a related area.

The largest number (65 percent) of personnel in this study indicated that their baccalaureate degree was from a state college or university. Full-time and part-time personnel were not compared on this item in the 1968 study. However, Eddy reported that 65 percent of the personnel in his study (those giving 25 percent or more of their time to religious affairs at state universities in 1967) had received degrees from private or church-related colleges. The educational background, then, of the modal full-time religious coordinator as found in the Eddy study is seen to contrast sharply with that of the part-time personnel who predominated in the 1968 study. The full-time director or coordinator of religious affairs typically is a church or private college graduate and holds a theological degree as his highest degree. The modal part-time staff person, on the other hand, is a graduate of a state college and has earned a doctorate in education, psychology, or a related field.

In addition to information about general education background, information was sought regarding specialized preparation in university religious affairs.

TABLE 14
SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

	Part Time No.	%	Full Time No.	%
No Answer	14	10	23	55
None	100	71	6	14
Yes, Total	26	19	13	31
in Seminary	7	5	4	10
in Graduate School	2	1	3	7
in Internship	1	1	0	0
in Workshops	12	9	4	10
in Other Experiences	4	3	2	5
Total Respondents	140		42	

Note: Several respondents checked more than one option.

One hundred, or 71 percent, of the part-time personnel reported no specialized training in university religious affairs. This compares with 14 percent of the full-time personnel. A question was asked about the need for additional training. One-fourth of the part-time personnel expressed a desire for additional training; whereas, two-thirds of the full-time personnel indicated a need for additional training. With their more limited responsibilities for religious coordination, the part-time personnel generally expressed satisfaction with the adequacy of their training. Apparently the greater responsibilities laid upon the full-time personnel make demands beyond their level or type of training.

Likewise, the denomination preference of full-time personnel differs from that of part-time personnel. Eddy found one Jew and no Roman Catholics among the full-time personnel in his study. Because of difficulties in computer analysis of this item in the 1968 study, full-time and part-time personnel were

not differentiated. The following table contrasts the data on religious preference from the 1968 study with that from the Eddy study. The difference reflects the influence of the religious preferences of the larger number of part-time personnel in the 1968 study. Data for the Negro denominations were omitted because of the low percentage of returns from Negro institutions in the 1968 study.

TABLE 15
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

	Eddy Study		1968 Study	
	No.	%	No.	%
United Methodist	14	29	56	25
United Presbyterian	8	16	15	7
American Baptist	7	14	7	3
Southern Baptist	4	8	22	10
Presbyterian (U.S.)	4	8	15	7
Lutheran (L.C.A.)	4	8	5	2
Episcopalian	3	6	16	7
United Church, Congregationalist	3	6	16	7
Unitarian-Universalist	1	2	6	3
Jewish	1	2	4	2
Roman Catholic	0	0	27	12
Other Lutheran	0	0	9	4
Disciples, Christian Church	0	0	7	3
Other (Mormon, Christian Science)	0	0	17	8
Total	49	100	222	100

The full-time personnel tended strongly to be clergymen from the major Protestant denominations; whereas, the part-time personnel reflect more fully the diversity of religious expression in the United States.

Religious affiliation seems to have an influence on the selection of full-time personnel in religious affairs. This may be accounted for by several factors. Some religious denominations place greater emphasis on cultural expressions of religion and have a higher regard for work with other groups than do other denominations. Denominations differ also in the stress they make on higher education and in their flexibility in releasing ordained clergy to work in an institution not controlled by the denomination. Then, too, the historical roots of university religious affairs positions cannot be ignored. Some evolved from college chaplaincies and others from collegiate YMCA positions. All of these were at one time, as was true for all of higher education in the United States, Protestant dominated. It may be significant that eleven of the persons responding to the present study indicated previous YMCA experience. The full-time positions, too, tend to be at the older schools and in geographical regions most likely to have a continuing tradition of established Protestant practices.

Functions

What functions do coordinators of religious affairs perform? How do they conceive their tasks?

Fewer than 50 percent of either the full-time or part-time personnel reported responsibility for classroom teaching. This was true for 54 percent of the full-time personnel responding and for 63 percent of the part-time personnel. Classroom teaching, then, is more likely to be a part of the work of the person giving 50 percent or more of his time to religious coordination than that of the person engaged in religious coordination 10 percent or less of his time. The difference is even more marked when the amount of time devoted to such teaching is considered. The modal group among the full-time coordinators were those assigned to one-fourth to one-half time teaching. The modal category of the part-time personnel who teach was those teaching from one to ten percent of their time. The field of teaching was not analyzed from the standpoint of differences between full-time and part-time personnel in the 1968 study. A comparison with Eddy's data on full-time personnel leads to the inference that a high percentage of the full-time religious coordinators who teach do so in the academic area of religious studies. Eddy found that of 25 coordinators who taught, eight did so in religious studies. This represented nearly one-third of the group. In the present survey, eight persons, or 2.9 percent of the total, reported teaching in the area of religion. It seems safe to conclude that many of the personnel who devote 50 percent or more of their time to religious coordination fill out the balance of their assignments with teaching, frequently in the area of religious studies. The part-time person in religious coordination on the other hand finds teaching a minor responsibility. When he does teach, it is most frequently in the field of education, psychology, or a related area.

Personnel were asked how they used their time allotted to religious coordination. The categories used were those developed by Eddy in his study with the addition of civil celebrant or worship leader. Coordination was defined on his questionnaire as "working with student religious groups, campus ministers, state and national religious agencies."

For nearly all of the persons responding to the 1968 study, coordination or liaison with student religious organizations and campus ministers was their most important religious activities function. In addition, nearly one-third reported some cocurricular programming, counseling, and communications responsibilities. Less than one-sixth have responsibilities as civil celebrant and then only to a very limited degree—less than 10 percent of their time.

When the part-time personnel who responded were compared with the full-time personnel, significant differences in their functions were evident.

The limited amount of time which the part-time personnel devote to religious affairs is apparently exhausted in liaison and advising functions. Incidental amounts are devoted to counseling students regarding religious problems and leadership in such public ceremonies as prayer and baccalaureate.

TABLE 16
TIME SPENT IN RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS FUNCTIONS

	Modal Categories	
	Part-Time	Full-Time
Coordination	67-100%	10-20%
Cocurricular Programming	34-50%	34-50%
Counseling	6-10%	10-20%
Civil Celebration	1-5%	1-5%

Full-time personnel spend a smaller percentage of their time in liaison efforts with student groups and campus ministers. They report devoting more of their time to counseling. This study found cocurricular programming to be the most important function for these personnel; whereas, the Eddy study found counseling to be slightly more important. Both studies found that full-time personnel devoted rather large percentages of their time to counseling and cocurricular programming as well as to coordination, in contrast to the part-time personnel.

Functions can be carried out in a number of styles or in preferred roles in relating to people. Nine roles or patterns of relating to others were listed on the questionnaire. Instructions were given to rank these from most preferred to least preferred. Table 17 presents the data secured in response to this question.

TABLE 17
ROLES OR PATTERNS OF RELATING TO OTHERS

Role	Best Describes (No. Listing First)		Least Describes (No. Listing Last)	
Counselor	1	51	9	6
Resource Person	2	42	7 (tie)	7
Interpreter	3	36	7 (tie)	7
Facilitator	4	35	6	15
Initiator	5	23	5	18
Student Affairs Educator	6	20	4	25
Religious Voice	7	13	3	28
Reconciler	8	11	2	41
Worship Leader	9	7	1	65

See Appendix C for definitions used on the questionnaire.

Since this question was asked in terms of the person's perception of the way he handles the job of religious coordination, it is obvious that religious coordinators generally see themselves to be educators rather than clergymen, as responders rather than initiators, and as facilitators rather than authority figures in the area of religion.

No comparisons were made in the present study between the full-time and part-time personnel in this regard. Eddy in his study asked a similar question of the full-time religious coordinators. The full-time personnel like-

wise expressed a preference for the counselor's role. However, initiator and worship leader ranked high, second and third places in preference respectively. These roles, however, were reported to be less important in the amount of time actually spent. The roles of facilitator and resource person required more time. Apparently full-time personnel, who generally are ordained clergymen with theological training, are more likely to view their positions from the standpoint of religious functionaries than is true for the part-time personnel.

Professional Affiliation

TABLE 18
Membership in Professional Associations

	Part-Time N = 140		Full-Time N = 42	
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)	37	27%	3	7%
American College Personnel Association (ACPA)	26	19%	1	2%
National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (NAWDAC)	12	9%	0	0%
Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs (ACURA)	3	2%	21	50%
Prior Knowledge of ACURA	22	16%	28	67%

In contrast to the full-time personnel, who are most frequently (50 percent) affiliated with the Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs (ACURA), the part-time personnel most frequently affiliate (27 percent) with the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). One-fifth of those responding reported membership in the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). A number equal to about half the percentage of women who responded as having religious affairs functions are members of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (NAWDAC).

Less than 3 percent of the part-time personnel who answered this question reported that they are members of the Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs; whereas, 50 percent of the full-time personnel did. Only 15 percent of the part-time people reported having knowledge of ACURA before filling out the questionnaire. This contrasts with two-thirds of the full-time personnel. (This latter figure is probably low because of some contamination by the inclusion of responses of a few campus ministers who were asked by deans of students to respond to the questionnaire.)

Implications for Professional Associations

The Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs (ACURA) was established in 1959 with stated purposes to bring together

university staff members assigned administrative responsibility for religious affairs. Such association, it was hoped, would aid in clarifying the role of religion in university religious life and in training personnel to coordinate university religious affairs. The organization was also intended to effect a liaison with several groups—student religious movements, professional student personnel associations, and national religious and education agencies.

According to the data in the present study, ACURA is apparently known primarily in those institutions which have full-time religious affairs positions; yet its purposes indicate a desire to be of service to all institutions of higher education. The association's efforts have been expended primarily in the past through issuance of a quarterly newsletter to its members and an annual conference which has attracted, generally, members and few campus ministers. Since membership in the association has been limited largely to those institutions with full-time religious coordination positions, the effective service of the association would appear to be to about 10 percent of its intended constituency.

What means are available to ACURA to serve better the personnel engaged in religious coordination at America's public colleges and universities? Obviously, more attention needs to be directed to those colleges which have only part-time religious coordination personnel. In-service training is a major function of some professional associations and might be considered by ACURA.

The question was asked, "Do you feel the need for additional training in religious affairs?" More than 42 percent of those responding to this question answered affirmatively. This number included 29 percent of the part-time personnel and 70 percent of the full-time personnel. Apparently the experience of many of the full-time personnel is that their ministerial and church college background and training has not prepared them adequately to serve in religious affairs on a public college campus. Both groups represent an area of potential service for ACURA. The needs of full-time personnel can perhaps be met through use of existing means—publications and conferences; but what of the part-time personnel who are not members of ACURA and are generally ignorant of its existence? ACURA, if it is to satisfy its purposes, must expend greater effort to serve the needs of part-time personnel. Surveys are needed to identify the real and felt needs of the part-time personnel. More information could be provided through a wider circulation of Association mailings. Regional conferences would provide opportunity for additional workshops. Since the part-time personnel indicate a high degree of membership in other associations, ACURA might cosponsor projects or programs with such groups as NASPA and ACPA.

SUMMARY

The majority (65 percent) of America's public colleges and universities identify a person on their staffs who has responsibility for at least some of the functions defined as religious coordination. Generally these persons occupy a position on the student affairs staff. The majority report to the chief student personnel officer.

As to percentage of time devoted to religious affairs, these personnel exhibit a bimodal population. Two-thirds spend less than 10 percent of their time in religious coordination, and of this group over 90 percent stated that this amount is less than 5 percent. One-fifth of the population, however, reported that at least 50 percent of their time was expended in religious coordination. Both the 1968 and 1972 studies indicate that 50 to 60 of these positions exist and that the number may have decreased slightly since the first study reported in 1961.

Who, then, are the university staff persons who devote less than one-tenth of their time to religious coordination? The largest number, nearly three-eighths, are the chief student personnel officers at their institutions. Approximately 8 percent reported having been ordained as clergymen; half that number had had pastoral experience. However, these characteristics were not considered to be qualifications for their current positions. One-fifth did report some specialized training in religious coordination generally in the form of a workshop. Over one-fourth reported a need for additional training in this area.

The majority of the time of the part-time person in religious affairs is expended in the liaison or coordination function. He spends a lesser percentage of his time in religious counseling or cocurricular programming than does the full-time person.

The person devoting more than 50 percent of his time to religious affairs generally has a title indicating his function; for example, director of religious life. He is a member of the student affairs staff. In addition to responsibility for liaison with student religious organizations and campus ministers, he generally has at least advisory responsibility for cocurricular programs dealing with religion. Frequently he teaches an academic course in the religious studies program. His training tends to be in the area of theology. He is likely to be an ordained Protestant clergyman although this was not reported to be an essential qualification for the position. He expresses a need for additional training for his work.

The person performing religious coordination functions, whether part-time or full-time, operates on an interface between the educational and religious institutions. If he is successful, he helps each to respect the integrity of the other in order that they might cooperate, yet not become excessively entangled, in the total education and welfare of their mutually shared clientele.

Appendix A

A Statement Regarding the Relationships between _____ University and Religious Groups

Since the university holds the educational philosophy that "a university education is the sum total of experiences one has on and about the university campus," religious experiences are a legitimate part of the university's total educational concern. However, being a state-assisted university, _____ cannot, as an institution, make provisions for the fulfillment of religious needs of students and faculty. Furthermore, students of many religious persuasions and no religious persuasion are admitted without distinction to _____ University. Consequently, the student body and faculty of _____ are religiously pluralistic. This means that no single program of worship, religious education, or pastoral care can serve the needs of the _____ family.

For these reasons, _____ depends upon the various religious bodies to meet the religious needs represented in the university.

Recognizing the multiple faith needs and refusing to rule out the free exercise of religion, also a constitutional right of the individual, _____ University has established the Office of Religious Affairs, one of whose functions is to serve as a channel of communication between the college and the religious groups and to extend a welcome and make more effective the efforts of responsible religious groups to minister to _____ students and faculty.

This relationship has been implemented primarily on one level in the past. Recognition is given student religious groups, as any other student group, which organize in accordance with the regulations established by the _____ Student Association. Such groups have the right to:

1. Reserve meeting rooms.
2. Publicize the meetings of the group.
3. Invite student membership.
4. Have an organization mailbox in the Student Center.
5. Open an account for the organization in the Bursar's Office.
6. Hold fund-raising activities.
7. Appear as a group at university sponsored functions.
8. Receive religious preference information.
9. Name representatives to the Student Religious Council which sponsors university-wide functions of religious nature.
10. Be represented in university publications.
11. Have the religious advisor of the group be a member of the Council of Religious Advisors.

It is further proposed that beginning with the 1964 school year that specific recognition also be given to the Religious Advisors as qualified professional workers in their own right.

The President will extend to the Religious Advisor of recognized student groups, upon recommendation of the Vice President of Student Affairs and the Director of Religious Affairs, except those who are students working on _____ University degrees, an official university Identification Card which will allow the bearer such privileges as:

Full use of the library
Permanent staff parking permit
Use of campus recreational facilities
Cashing checks at Bursar's Office ($50 limit)
Bookstore discount
Faculty rate at athletic and cultural events
Listing in the campus directory and other publications

Religious Advisors will be included on the mailing list of Religious Affairs Office and will receive university notices.

The Religious Advisors will be considered affiliated staff related to the University through the Office of Religious Affairs.

(signed)

President, _____ University
(date)

Appendix B

A Guide to Religious Counseling at _____ University

What is religious counseling?

Religious counseling is a process through which the insights and resources of religious faith are applied to particular human needs. Usually it is carried on between two people, though sometimes it may utilize group processes. Like all counseling, its purpose is to enable human beings to achieve the fullest possible understanding and enjoyment of life. Perhaps the best word for this is "meaning." Meaning in life is a result of the basic attitudes, values, and goals which guide and motivate one's existence.

The counseling service of the Office of Religious Programs is part of its total educational program in the area of religion, which features outstanding lecturers, book reviews, noncredit courses, films, reading library, and other resources. Counseling, though it may take various specialized forms, may be broadly defined as but one method of *education*, which literally means the "leading out" of persons into intellectual and emotional wholeness.

How is religious counseling related to other kinds?

Any human problem may have a religious aspect, and similarly a problem considered to be "religious" may affect one's whole personality. This means that while religious counseling is potentially helpful in the solution of any problem, it is not a substitute for specialized kinds of vocational, psychological, and psychiatric counseling. These techniques on the other hand, do not replace the necessity for developing one's own ethical values, guiding insights, and motivating purposes. Religious faith, while it values physical and emotional health, is not synonymous with them, and seeks to provide resources for responding creatively to crisis, failure, guilt, frustration, loneliness, and even death. Dealing with these issues of ultimate concern to man is the appropriate province and definition of religion, and hence of religious counseling.

The Office of Religious Programs cooperates closely with other University counseling agencies. The Director of Religious Programs is a member of the University Committee on Student Counseling and the staff maintains up-to-date information about the various counseling resources available in the University community.

What is the training and experience of religious counselors?

Religious counselors have varying degrees of training and experience. In recent years most accredited seminaries have required intensive courses in

psychology, personality development, and pastoral counseling. In addition, many persons completing their theological studies within the past few years have elected programs of supervised clinical training. Many of the religious counselors at _____ University have participated in the in-service training seminars or the two-week counseling workshops presented within recent years by the Office of Religious Programs and the University's Psychological Counseling Division.

The role of the religious counselor overlaps with teaching and pastoral roles in most cases. One may legitimately ask whether the religious worker's commitment to the propagation of his own faith or tradition will limit his ability to meet individuals with their unique and complex needs. Is not the counselee, because he usually comes at a time of unusual stress, especially vulnerable to exploitation by those who would seek to recruit or "convert" him? The answer is, of course, that the value and effectiveness of any counseling can be no greater than the skill and integrity of the counselor, and the degrees of these qualities vary greatly among religious counselors.

Every effort is made in the assigning of religious counselors to _____ University to find persons of the highest integrity, with basic training in psychology and counseling, and with a willingness to be a part of the teamwork of the whole University community in serving students. Most of the religious counselors at _____ familiarize themselves thoroughly with the range of resources available, are quick to spot needs that call for specialized services, and are eager to cooperate through referrals and consultations appropriate to the situation.

When is a religious counselor likely to be most helpful?

1. When there is need for specialized knowledge of religious history, theology, or Scriptures.
2. In problems relating to transferring or converting from one religious tradition to another.
3. In problems arising from interfaith marriage or premarital difficulties involving religious differences.
4. In conflicts between the individual and his environment growing from religio-cultural differences, questions about religious authority, and achievement of individual religious maturity.
5. In ethical and moral problems where the guidance of religious teachings is a factor.

Appendix C

University Religious Affairs Coordination Models

	Prominent Components	*General Observations*
Chapel-Chaplain	Chapel building Chaplains with University portfolio University Choir University Chapel Services	Upstages the more traditional creed-code-cultic interests present in the university. Gives dramatic focus to university religious affairs generally. Counseling function of chaplaincy carries over to all models.
Religious Studies	Religion Department Professors of Religion Research and Publication Title Chairs and Lectureships Special Libraries in Religion	Fits classroom-library-laboratory model of higher education. Coordination often a subordinated professional commitment and involvement.
University Governance	Student affairs educator-administrator staffing High-level bureaucratic and adhocratic activity Cocurricular programs in religion	System and power center oriented; educationally, extracurricular; permitting judicious exercise of the politico-educational art of the possible. Separation formula receives most systematic and sometimes sophisticated renderings.

Human Relations	Minority student affairs International students Student religious affairs Student volunteer projects Human potentials programming	Modeled in terms of humanistic intentions of university as well as religious bodies. Contemporary vitality comes especially as white spaces of university become blackened with human-ness.
Social Policy	Advocacy leadership, often in high profile Research-education-action orientation Community action projects in local community and abroad	Typically in rapport with Consciousness III, tending to work havoc in most Consciousness II universities. Potential for good and/or bad new(s) creation open to mixed interpretations. Requires substantial funding from private sources.

NOTE: Models above are drawn as typological constructs. Examples named only approximate model in terms of their centering dynamic. In no instance is model intended as exclusive descriptor of a given university's religious affairs program.

CEM—4/14/71

Bibliography

Books

Allen, H. E. *Religion in the State University: An Initial Exploration.* Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1950.

American Association of School Administrators. *Religion in the Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1964.

Austin, C. G. *A Century of Religion at the University of Michigan, a Case Study in Religion and the State University.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Office of Religious Affairs, 1957.

Austin, C. G., and Smith, S. A. *Religious Cooperation in State Universities: An Historical Sketch.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Office of Religious Affairs, 1957.

Baly, D. *Academic Illusion.* Greenwich, Connecticut: Th Seabury Press, 1961.

Hammond, P. E. *The Campus Clergyman.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Kauper, P. G. *Religion and the Constitution.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.

Littell, F. H. *From State-Church to Pluralism.* New York: Doubleday and Company, 1962.

McLean, M. D. (ed.) *Religious Studies in Public Universities.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1967.

Minneman, C. E. (ed.) *Students, Religion, and the Contemporary University.* Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University Press, 1970.

Overholt, W. A. *Religion in American Colleges and Universities.* Student Personnel Monograph #14. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1970.

Phenix, P. H. *Religious Concerns in Contemporary Education.* New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Shedd, C. *The Church Follows Its Students.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

Tremmel, W. C. *A Different Drum.* New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1964.

Underwood, K. *The Church, The University, and Social Policy.* 2 vols. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Walter, E. A. (ed.) *Religion and the State University.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958.

Articles and Periodicals

Arthur, T. C. "Religion in the Public University," *National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal,* XXXI, (Winter, 1968), 69-74.

Balcer, C., Harris, J., and Holmgren, M. "Religious Activities in Public Colleges," *St. Cloud State College Bulletin,* XIV, (May, 1959).

Barnes, R. E. "Where the Action Is," *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal,* IV, (April, 1967), 183-185.

Buerk, J. A. "Changing Role of the Protestant Campus Minister," *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal,* II, (April, 1965),

Cantelon, J. E. "Whatever Happened to Religious Emphasis Week?" *The Christian Century,* LXXXII, (March 31, 1965), 396-398.

Carey, J. J. "Jerusalem and Athens: The Religious Workers on the College Campus," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* XL, (January, 1962), 426-431.

Ferre, N. F. S. "Place of the Chapel in a Christian College," *Journal of Higher Education,* XXXVIII, (April, 1967), 173-183.

Hammond, P. E. "Campus Ministerial Morale—A Second Look," *Religious Education,* LXIX, (July, 1965), 267-272.

Hammond, P. E. "The Campus Ministry and Academic Values," *Journal of Higher Education,* XXXVI, (May, 1965), 274-278.

Harrod, G. W. "Religious Activities on Campuses of Colleges and Universities," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* XXXVIII, (March, 1960), 555-557.

Havice, C. W. (ed.) "Religion on Campus," Section X of *Handbook of College and University Administration: Academic,* ed. A. Knowles. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Jones, G. W. "A Rationale for Religious Programming in State Universities," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* VIII, (November, 1967), 385-389.

Jones, W. H. "The Minister on Campus," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* IV, (December 15, 1969), 6.

Jospe, A. "Religion in the University—A Terminal Case?" *Religious Education,* LXVII, (March, 1972), 123-130.

Katz, G., and Southerland, H. P. "Religious Pluralism and the Supreme Court," *Daedalus,* XCVI, (Winter, 1967), 180-192.

Littell, F. H. "Religion in Colleges and Universities," *The Encyclopedia of Education,* ed. L. C. Deighton, VII, (1971), 461-464.

Miller, R. C. (ed.) "Symposium: Religion in Colleges and Universities," *Religious Education,* LXIII, (January, 1968), 5-58.

Milliken, R. L. "Religious Activities—A Forgotten Personnel Service," *Journal of College Student Personnel,* V, (March, 1964) 161-162.

Minneman, C. E., *et al.* "Innovations in Religious Programming by State Universities," *Detroit Convention Abstracts* (Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1968), 132-133.

Minneman, C. E., "Religion as a University Affair," *Michigan College Personnel Association Journal,* V, (Spring, 1968), 21-24.

Rossman, P. "The Denominational Chaplain in the State University," *Religious Education,* LV, (May, 1960), 174-181.

Rossman, P. "The Morale of the Campus Minister," *Religious Education,* LVII, (March, 1963), 110-113, 159-160.

Schmidt, R. "Religion and the Community College," *Religious Education,* LXVIII, (January, 1973), 115-125.

Stroup, H. "Coordinating Councils of Religious Organizations in Public Colleges and Universities," *Religious Education,* LVIII, (July, 1963), 362-365.

Study Commission of the Council of Guidance and Personnel Associations. "Job Analyses of Educational Personnel Workers," *Occupations*, XXX, pt. 2 (October, 1951), 1-22.

Sullivan, W. J. "The Catholic University and the Non-Catholic Student," *Religious Education*, LXIV, (May, 1969), 188-193.

Williamson, E. G., and Zander, D. "Student Organizations and Student Activities: College and University," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, ed. R. L. Ebel, (1969), 1359-1367.

Unpublished Doctoral Dissertations

Bales, L. A. "Administrator's Concept of the Relationship of the Campus Ministry to the Publicly Sponsored University." University of Indiana, 1964.

Crouch, C. H. "Religious Activities in Tax-Supported Colleges and Universities." Arizona State University, 1962.

Eaton, J. A. "Religious Emphasis Week: An Introduction for Student Personnel Workers." Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Eddy, J. P. "Comparison of the Characteristics and Activities of Religious Personnel Employed in Selected Four-Year State Colleges and Universities in the United States." Southern Illinois University, 1968.

Miller, E. N.. "The Residence Hall Ministry at Pennsylvania State University." Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

Peterson, H. D. "The Role of Religion at Selected State Colleges and Universities in the United States." Washington State University, 1965.

Platt, R. M. "Religion in State-Supported Senior Colleges and Universities." Texas Technological University, 1963.

Unpublished Report

Marine, J. "Student Activities Staff Functions: Sum and Substance." Mimeographed report prepared for American College Personnel Association, Commission IV, April, 1968.

Index

Advisement: of cocurricular programs, 21, 33, 49f; of student interfaith councils, 13f, 18f, 21, 40, 41; of student religious organizations, 9ff, 14, 34, 36, 38ff, 49f; regarding buildings for religious purposes, 25f, 38
Aid to religion, as basis for cocurricular programs, 31
American College Personnel Association, 3, 51, 52
Assistant dean of students, 27, 37
Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs, v, 1, 3, 30, 35, 51; purposes of, 51

Baccalaureate, 40, 49
Balcer, C. (St. Cloud Study), 2, 11, 13
Ball State University, v, 3
Bible chairs, 8
Budget for religious coordination, 4, 29, 38, 40, 41
Buildings: for religious coordination, 25ff, 29, 31, 40, 42; for student religious organizations, 25, 36, 42

Campus ministers: basis for recognition, 8, 20, 40, 57; morale of, 8; numbers of, 20f; privileges granted, 37, 38, 39; responsibilities assigned by universities, 24, 26, 30, 34, 38, 39, 44, 51
Chapel buildings, 25, 35, 40, 58
Chaplains: named by colleges, 1, 8f, 27, 35, 40, 48, 58; named by religious groups, 8, 11, 38
Charity drives, 13, 18, 19
Chief academic officer, 42
Chief student personnel officer, 8, 14f, 27, 28, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 45, 46, 53, 55
Christian Century, The, 30
Cocurricular programs, 2, 13f, 18f, 20ff, 26, 31, 35, 38, 49f, 53, 56, 58
College unions, 39, 40, 42
Communications, between university staff and clergy, 20, 22, 37, 54
Coordination: definition, 1f, 49; patterns of, 34ff, 50
Coordinator of religious affairs: characteristics, 44ff; functions of, 8, 20, 25f, 32f; numbers of, 1, 13, 27; reasons for hiring, 14, 28
Counseling, 2, 24, 26, 38, 39, 40, 49f, 53, 56f
Crouch, Charles A., 2, 6, 11, 13f, 30

Danforth Foundation, The, 31
Dean of students; *see* Chief student personnel officer
Director of Religious Activities; *see* Coordinator of religious affairs
Discrimination based on religion, 31

Eastern Michigan University, v
Eastern religions, 31
Eddy, John Paul, 1, 3, 4, 14, 28, 44ff
Education of coordinators, 37, 40, 46ff
Educational rationale for cocurricular religious programs, 31, 45
Extracurricular religion programs; *see* Cocurricular programs

Faculty as coordinators, 24, 27, 34, 38, 41, 49
Federal service academies, 8, 35
Full-time coordinators: characteristics, 4, 28, 46; definition, 44; education, 40, 46f, 53; functions, 14, 35, 49ff, 56; prior employment, 39, 40; professional affiliations, 51f; qualifications, 40, 42, 46, 48, 53; religious affiliations, 40, 41, 42, 47, 48; role patterns, 39, 40, 41, 42, 50

Hammond, P. E., 20, 22
Human relations, an approach to religious coordination, 35, 42, 58

Inservice training, 2, 47, 52, 57

Jesus Movement, 31
Jones, George W., 3

Lectures on religion, 2, 13, 24, 30, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 56, 58
Legal questions, v, 10, 36, 43, 54, 58
Liaison: with campus ministers, 14ff, 20ff, 26, 33, 37, 40, 41, 49f; with student religious organizations, 14ff, 26, 33, 49f

Marital statuses of coordinators of religious affairs, 46
Miller, Alexander, 1
Military academies; *see* Federal service academies
Ministerial associations (for campus clergy), 20, 26, 36, 38, 39, 42, 54
Minneman, Charles E., v, 1, 35
Models of coordination, 34ff

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), 51, 52
National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (NAWDAC), 51
National Council of Churches, 29
Negro state colleges, 4, 8, 35, 48

Occult religions, 31
Offices: for coordinators, 39, 40, 41; for campus ministers, 39, 41, 42
Ordination of coordinators, 38, 42, 46, 48, 53

Paraprofessional staff, 28f
Part-time coordinators: characteristics, 28, 37, 46; definition, 44; education, 37, 46f, 53; functions, 37, 49ff; professional affiliations, 51; qualifications, 37, 38, 46, 48, 53; religious affiliations, 37, 47, 48; training needs, 37, 40, 47
Peterson, H. D., 2, 13f
Policies: nature, 6ff; regarding campus ministers, 8f; regarding student religious organizations, 6ff; sources of, 6, 10
Presidents (college), 10, 42, 55
Professional self-image of religious coordinators, 50f
Publications on religious activities, 2, 36, 40, 42, 54

Qualifications for religious coordinators, 37, 38, 40, 42, 46ff, 53

Radical student groups, 10
Rationales for cocurricular religious programs, 31, 34, 43
Recognition: of campus ministers, 8ff, 34ff, 55; of religious organizations, 6ff, 14f, 34ff, 54
Regional differences in provisions for religious coordination, 4, 6f, 10ff, 13, 15ff, 18f, 20f, 24f, 29, 44f, 48
Religious activities committee (faculty), 38
Religious activities council (student); *see* Student interfaith council
Religious affiliation of religious coordinators, 37, 40, 47
Religious emphasis week, 2, 13f, 29f, 38, 41
Religious preference information, 14, 18, 22, 30f, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42
Residence hall programs, 8, 40
Retreats, 18, 19, 41, 42
Rossman, Parker, 8, 10

Salaries of religious coordinators, 4, 46
Social policy research, an approach to religious coordination, 31, 35, 43, 59
Speaker policy, 15, 17
Staffs for religious coordination, 28, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42
Student activities calendar, 15, 17
Student activities directors, 3, 18, 27, 33, 36, 38
Student interfaith councils: programs, 2, 13, 18f, 26, 36; sponsorship, 6, 11, 18, 21, 30, 32, 38, 40, 41, 54
Student religious organizations: number of, 3, 13, 15f, 31; privileges granted, 14, 15, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 54; requirements for, 14, 15, 37, 54
Study of religion: academic, 29, 31, 34f, 42, 49, 58; cocurricular, 2, 13, 29, 34, 39, 42, 56

Titles of staff in religious coordination, 26f, 33, 45, 53
Theological education of religious coordinators, 37, 41, 46, 53

Vice president of student affairs; *see* Chief student personnel officer
Voluntary community service of students, 13, 18, 38, 39, 42, 59

Women in religious coordination, 40, 41, 46
Worship services, 8, 18, 19, 24, 35, 39, 40, 49, 51, 54

YMCA, 27, 39, 48
YWCA, 27, 41